

is a 40-percent lag in production on the home front. But even when I was in the European theaters of war in September, I was told there was a lack of supplies at the front and as I stated several times at London, and at the front, and after my return to the United States, that there was great need of ammunition and wire. After the optimistic statements by General Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill last summer that war would soon be over and there was no general appeal for war supplies, it cannot be wondered at, that industry began to give thought to reconversion and the workers began to think of peacetime jobs. If mistakes have been made in production it is largely due to the lack of frankness—this filtering of news—this less than the whole story that is given to the public. The public is losing faith in the stories of our victories. It is time that the half-truth stop and the public be told the whole truth.

It is the only way we shall secure full war production for our fighting forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE FROM ROLL CALL

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of the reason why I am not recorded on the vote this afternoon. The bells in my office failed to ring. I was on the floor until 3 p. m., but then had gone to my office. When I came over the roll call had been finished. Nevertheless, had I been present I would have voted "no."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House on the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie and the estate of James Evans; and

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 6, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS

The committee will hold a hearing on Wednesday, December 6, 1944, at 10 a. m., in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture, to consider H. R. 5450, to revise and codify the criminal laws of the United States and to hold public hearings thereon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2060. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the requirement for water for military and civilian use in San Diego County, Calif., was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEMKE: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 209. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of North Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4795. A bill to authorize the undertaking of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEMKE: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4808. A bill to amend the Fact Flinders Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4857. A bill to confirm the claims of Charles Gaudet under Spanish patents to section 18, township 11 south, range 5 east, and section 21, township 12 south, range 5 east, St. Helena meridian, Parish of St. James, State of Louisiana, together with all accretion; with amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 5581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5582. A bill authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5583. A bill establishing wage differential for leadingmen and quartermen at all naval establishments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5584. A bill to enable the mothers, fathers, and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to

such cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 322. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 669. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 5535. A bill for the relief of Evelyn DeNunzio, Mrs. Mary Capodanno, and the legal guardian of Vincent Capodanno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILEY:

H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of the estate of James W. Taylor III; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6231. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Agriculture of the California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, Sacramento, Calif., relative to making more equitable price stabilization provisions for agricultural production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6232. Also, resolution of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Agriculture of the California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, Sacramento, Calif., relative to dates for establishing ceiling prices on farm products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in mercy, love, and power, we come knowing that all else is vanity, that all other cisterns are empty and broken and in Thee alone is the fountain of life. Thou knowest the stern responsibilities that confront us and the pathetic limitations of our knowledge. Thou knowest, too, our deep necessities and our unutterable desires. We can bring to Thee but unfulfilled aspirations and many a failure that makes us ashamed. When we foolishly endeavor to live our lives without Thee, we deny our reason, we blot out our hope, and destroy our joy.

Forbid that our lives should be so busy with the trivial traffic of the common days that, as in the Bethlehem inn of long

ago, the highest and best should be crowded out of our reckoning. As the advent month brings a song that soars above the sobs and a flutter of wings above the woe of a warring world, lead our jaded and worldly wise spirits out to the peaceful plains where with the simple faith of shepherds we may hear the angels sing. So pour upon our Nation's leaders Thy spirit of counsel and understanding that they may follow the star of their highest designs to a future for all humanity glorified by the light which comes from Thee. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 5, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate.

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecocoechea;

S. 516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Works Progress Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.;

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn;

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum;

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files;

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatraut;

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell;

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen;

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw;

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall; and

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2185) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. GILCHRIST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2148. An act for the relief of Elias Baumgarten;

H. R. 2626. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

H. R. 3614. An act for the relief of the Queen City Brewing Co.;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; and

H. R. 5564. An act to fix the rate of tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employer and employees for the calendar year 1945.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee;

S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian;

S. 1877. An act to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans; and

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080).

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hall	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Buck	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Langer	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maoney	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maybank	Weeks
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA—CREDENTIALS

Mr. ELLENDER presented the credentials of JOHN H. OVERTON, chosen a Senator from the State of Louisiana for the term commencing January 3, 1945, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944, JOHN H. OVERTON was duly

chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on January 3, 1945.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, J. H. Davis, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge, this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1944.

J. H. DAVIS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL]

WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

DECEMBER 6, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE (HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT), DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure (Healing Arts Practice Act), District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1944, in compliance with the terms

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a monthly report of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs made in response to Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Theodore B. Stothart.....	3801 Fourth St. SE.....	War Department, Adjutant General's Office.....	\$1,800
Amy J. Tishendorf.....	4434 First St. NE.....	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief Staff.....	2,000
Col. Lewis Sanders.....	1911 R St. NW.....	War Department.....	6,000
Col. David A. Watt.....	Clinton, Md.....	do.....	6,000

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS, Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4968. A bill to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2150. A bill for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316);

H. R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Enid M. Albertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317);

H. R. 3484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl W. Peterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318);

H. R. 3781. A bill for the relief of Hall Faris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319);

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352);

H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of James LeRoy Eden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320);

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Bertha LeFrancq; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321); and

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Wolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman, and for Mrs. Harriett W. Vanderhoef and Allan Vanderhoef; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335);

H. R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1336);

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Whiddon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1338); and

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of John L. MacNeil; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3191. A bill for the relief of Lillian Hill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323);

H. R. 3414. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Robbins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345);

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Miss Anne Watt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346);

H. R. 4101. A bill for the relief of P. E. Brannen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1350);

H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1347);

H. R. 4525. A bill for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348); and

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Harold Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Rose B. Luzar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339);

H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Hearn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340);

H. R. 3814. A bill for the relief of M. Senders & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341);

H. R. 3995. A bill for the relief of Walter Lundmark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1324);

H. R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Steel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325);

H. R. 4144. A bill for the relief of Brig. Gen. Louis J. Fortier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326);

H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342);

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Karl Lungstrass; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343);

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of the estate of Floyd M. Adair, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Luther Marcus Smith, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Sandy O. Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1329); and

H. R. 4962. A bill for the relief of Jessie Springsteen and John Springsteen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1556. A bill for the relief of Archie Barwick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330);

H. R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331);

H. R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332);

H. R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1334);

H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of William H. Crompton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1353); and

H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333).

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 251)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 347), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-seventh Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1944, be printed as a Senate document.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, December 6, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee;

S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; and

S. 1877. An act to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to

the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MEAD introduced a bill (S. 2212) for the relief of Thomas F. Gray, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2148. An act for the relief of Elias Baumgarten;

H. R. 2626. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; and

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3614. An act for the relief of the Queen City Brewing Co.;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.; and

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5564. An act to fix the rate of tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employer and employees for the calendar year 1945; to the Committee on Finance.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of questions and answers on the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. I believe these questions and answers will be of help to Senators in considering the problem of the social-security freeze, which now is pending before the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Question. What is the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund?

Answer. It is a fund composed of amounts accumulated under the old-age and survivors insurance program. The fund is held by the board of trustees under authority of the Social Security Act. The three members of this board, each of whom serves in an ex-officio capacity, are the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Chairman of the Social Security Board. The Secretary of the Treasury serves as managing trustee.

Question. From what sources do receipts come into the trust fund?

Answer. Receipts come primarily from contributions paid by covered workers and their employers toward old-age and survivors insurance. A secondary source of receipts is interest received on investments held by the fund. A third potential source of revenue for the trust fund is provided in an amendment to the Social Security Act in 1943, which authorizes, as a Government contribution, the appropriation to the trust fund of such additional sums out of general revenues as may be required to finance the benefits and payments provided under the Social Security Act.

Question. Can the money in the trust fund be spent for any other purpose than to pay for old-age and survivors benefits and administrative expenses? Could money from the trust fund be used to pay out unemployment insurance benefits, for instance, if

unemployment compensation funds were exhausted?

Answer. No. The sums in the trust fund can be used for no other purpose than to pay old-age and survivors benefits and the administrative expenses of the program. There is no connection whatsoever between the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the unemployment trust fund, except that both operate under the Social Security Act.

Question. Does the managing trustee invest all the contributions that come into the trust fund?

Answer. He invests that portion of the trust fund which is not required for meeting current expenditures for benefits or administration.

Question. Can the managing trustee invest sums from the trust fund as he pleases?

Answer. No. According to the act, amounts in the fund not required for current expenditures must be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States Government or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. The reason for this limitation is that such investments are the safest in the world. It is also standard practice for all trust funds held by the Federal Government.

The investment feature of the trust fund is a procedure similar to that followed by sound business concerns. Banks, insurance companies, and others do not store in a vault all the money they receive. The money not currently needed is put to work—invested so it will earn interest.

Question. What investments were made for the fund during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1943, and June 30, 1944?

Answer. During the fiscal year 1943, special Treasury notes were bought to the amount of \$1,434,000,000 and Treasury bonds to the amount of \$125,000,000; during the fiscal year 1944, purchases of special Treasury notes totaled \$342,000,000, purchases of Treasury bonds, \$450,035,880, and Treasury certificates of indebtedness, \$380,000,000.

Question. How much does the interest from investments amount to?

Answer. The total amount of interest received on investments of the trust fund through June 30, 1944, was \$404,658,876.

Question. Doesn't investing sums from the trust fund in Government bonds mean that old-age and survivors insurance contributions are collected to pay for other Government activities?

Answer. No. The money is loaned to the Federal Government for use in the same way as money the Federal Government borrows from banks, insurance companies, individuals, etc. The loan must be repaid with interest.

Question. Are not workers covered by O. A. S. I. taxed twice to pay for their benefits?

Answer. No. The contributions are deposited in the trust fund and invested in Government bonds, i. e., the Treasury borrows them. It uses the money just as if it had been borrowed from banks. Later, when benefits are to be paid, the Treasury may have to get money by taxation to redeem the bonds held by the trust fund, so the trust fund can pay the benefits. These later taxes are not for the purpose of paying O. A. S. I. benefits. Rather, they are to pay for the cost of the war and the general operating expenses of the Government. If the trust fund were not there, the Treasury would have to borrow that much more from banks. Then in the future we would have to pay just as much in taxes to pay off the bonds held by the banks, and in addition we would have to be taxed to support the aged and survivors. So a contributory social security program which builds up a trust fund through payroll contributions now is really a device for getting wage earners as a group to finance their own future security by lending some of their present earnings to the Treasury, to be

repaid when needed. To this extent it reduces the amount of taxation which will be necessary in the future to meet our total obligations.

Question. If amounts from the trust fund are invested, does it not mean that when the money is needed to pay benefits it may not be there?

Answer. The investments of the trust fund may be converted to cash at any time. Moreover, every year the board of trustees submits a report to Congress on the operations and status of the trust fund during the preceding year and on its expected operation and status during the next 5 fiscal years. Thus, if there were ever any danger of there being too little money in the trust fund for payments, the deficit would be foreseen early enough so that remedial action could be taken.

Question. Is there enough in the fund now to take care of the liabilities when they come due?

Answer. No; there is not. At present the system is not self-supporting. The total liability which has accrued on a level premium basis for the payment of insurance benefits is several times in excess of the amount in the existing trust fund.

Question. Have the rates of contribution been raised?

Answer. No; the contributions have been kept at the original rates—1 percent of taxable wages for both employer and employee. The original act provided that the rates should rise to 1½ percent on January 1, 1940, to 2 percent on January 1, 1943, to 2½ percent on January 1, 1946, and to 3 percent on January 1, 1949. The social security amendments of 1939 modified this original schedule of contribution rates to provide that the rate of 1 percent each on employees and employers should continue in effect through 1942, but left the remainder of the schedule as originally enacted. The Revenue Act of 1942 provided that the 1-percent rates should continue through 1943. Public Law 211 of the Seventy-eighth Congress extended the 1-percent rates further through February 29, 1944, while the Revenue Act of 1943 extended the same rates throughout 1944. As it stands now, the 2-percent rates are to go into effect on January 1, 1945, the 2½-percent rates on January 1, 1946, and the 3-percent rates on January 1, 1949.

Question. Why was a graduated schedule of contributions incorporated in the 1935 Social Security Act?

Answer. It was incorporated in order to give employees, employers, and the economy generally an opportunity to become adjusted to the imposition of the pay-roll taxes.

Question. As time goes on, are benefit disbursements under the program expected to increase?

Answer. They are expected to increase markedly over a long period. The reason is that for many decades the number of persons aged 65 and over will be increasing and that an increasing proportion of such aged persons will be qualifying for benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system. At the beginning of 1940 there were about 9,000,000 persons aged 65 and over, equivalent to 6.8 percent of the total population. According to carefully developed estimates, the number of persons aged 65 and over may increase to about 22,000,000 or 14.4 percent of the population within 40 years. Moreover, the proportion of aged persons eligible to receive benefits under the program will be constantly increasing over the same 40 years.

Question. How much do present benefit payments total?

Answer. Present benefit payments are around \$200,000,000 a year.

Question. Has the volume of benefit payments increased or decreased on account of the war?

Answer. Benefit payments have increased steadily during the war, but not because of it. The increase has been less than had been expected under conditions of peace. Many thousands of workers 65 and over who have built up rights to benefits and who probably would have claimed them in more normal times have remained at their jobs. In addition, many persons already on the benefit rolls have suspended their benefit payments by returning to covered employment. These two groups combined constitute some 600,000 persons.

Question. To what extent are disbursements expected to increase?

Answer. Over a period of four decades disbursements may increase as much as 15 to 30 times the present rate.

Question. In making its actuarial projections of the future costs of the old-age and survivors insurance system what factors are taken into consideration?

Answer. Among the most important are: (1) Mortality; (2) population progress dependent upon births, deaths, emigration, and immigration; (3) family composition; (4) amount of employment; (5) amount of wages; (6) length of the productive period; (7) length of the period of dependent childhood; (8) length of the period of retirement; (9) invalidity; (10) interest rates; (11) migration between covered and uncovered employment; (12) the war.

Question. What do the actuarial calculations show as to future costs?

Answer. All actuarial calculations indicate a steeply increasing annual cost. The principal reasons are: (1) The growing number of aged persons in our population. (2) The growing number of aged persons who will become entitled to benefits. (3) The increasing amount of benefits per person due to the fact that size of benefits is related to the amount of earnings and length of employment in covered jobs.

Question. According to the actuarial estimates, how many aged people will be receiving O. A. S. I. benefits in 1960?

Answer. Two actuarial estimates have been made—one under low-cost assumptions and one under high. Under low assumptions, in the year 1960 there will be 3,500,000 aged persons receiving benefits; under the high assumptions 4,800,000. By the year 2000, which is as far as the projections have been carried, these figures will be 10,700,000 under the low assumptions and 19,300,000 under the high. There were 500,000 aged people receiving O. A. S. I. benefits as of June 30, 1944.

Question. How many children and widowed mothers will be getting benefits in 1960?

Answer. Under the low assumptions in the year 1960, 1,800,000 children and widowed mothers will be getting benefits; under the high assumptions 1,600,000. The smaller number of beneficiaries under the high assumptions results from the use of a projected table which assumes lighter mortality combined with a lower birth rate. The lower mortality rate would result in more aged persons qualifying for benefits. There were 340,000 children and widowed mothers receiving benefits as of June 30, 1944.

Question. Are not heavier contributions coming into the trust fund on account of the war, and do not these make up for the low contribution rate?

Answer. The contributions now being collected are higher, true; than was originally expected at the time of the 1939 amendments. During the fiscal year 1944, as a consequence of war, the contributions to the trust fund increased from \$691,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941 to \$1,292,000,000. This increase came about because more people worked more steadily and at higher wages. Approximately 47,000,000 workers received taxable wages in the calendar year 1943, as compared with only 35,000,000 in 1940 and less than 32,000,000 in 1938. The assets of

the trust fund rose from \$2,400,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 1941 to \$5,400,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 1944, an increase of \$3,000,000,000. But the increasing assets of the fund are not a net gain. In considering the increasing amount of contributions, account must be taken of the increased liabilities to which these assets give rise. The wages which account for the increased current receipts will also in the future serve to qualify many individuals for benefits who would not otherwise receive them, and will increase the potential benefit amounts payable to other individuals.

Question. Why does the Social Security Board think the contribution rates should be increased?

Answer. Prudent management requires emphasis on the long-range relationship of income and disbursements. At the 1 percent rate of contribution the system is not self-supporting. It is estimated that the level premium cost of the benefits now provided by the system is between 4 percent and 7 percent of the covered pay roll. This means that if pay-roll taxes of this magnitude (employer tax and employee taxes combined) had been levied from the beginning, and were continued indefinitely, the system as a whole would be just self-supporting. The present rates of contribution even under the most favorable prospects are not more than half the minimum level premium cost of the system. Moreover, they are only one-third the ultimate maximum rates provided by statute.

The Board believes that the rates of contributions should be raised at once to 2 percent each for employers and employees for the following reasons: (1) The existing rates of contributions are less than necessary to support the system on a level-premium basis; (2) the existing rates constitute a smaller proportion of the total cost than it is believed suitable to meet by employer and employee contributions; and (3) general economic conditions are such that increased rates of contribution could be borne without injury to the economy.

NECESSITY OF INCREASE IN PRODUCTION OF WAR MATÉRIEL—ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the address which Gen. Brehon Somervell, the commanding general of the Army Service Forces, delivered this morning in New York before the National Association of Manufacturers. General Somervell characterizes the address as the most important speech he has ever made. It deals with the question of matériel and supplies for our armed forces at this time. General Somervell says:

More matériel equals fewer casualties, a shorter war.

Mr. President, this is to my mind a tremendously interesting, timely, and challenging address. I believe it will be of interest not only to Members of the Senate, but to the whole country, and I ask that the address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the most important speech I have ever made.

Upon me at this moment rests the responsibility for how long this war will last; perhaps the fate of millions of men—their very lives.

Unless I can somehow pass this responsibility on to you, who represent such a large block of industry, and on to several hundred thousand American workers, I will have failed

those men; failed them at a time they most needed my support.

Worse than that, if I fail today to get this situation across to you and these workers, I will have failed all America—the twelve million in the armed forces, and the 10 times that number on the home front.

That is the reason for my earnestness today; that is why I believe this is the most important speech I have ever made.

This Nation has committed its troops to fighting the war in one specific fashion—with an overwhelming superiority of matériel.

We are a productive and resourceful people. Knowing our power to produce, we sent our men into war with this promise: You shall have an overpowering weight of everything it takes to win.

You shall have this weight because time and thus lives will be saved.

You shall have this weight because we would rather fire a ton of munitions than lose a single American soldier.

We, a productive people, elected to fight the war by that method. So far, we have made good on that promise; our tactics, our strategy, our victories have been shaped by it.

I have come here today to examine the current situation with you so that we may all see what it takes to live up to our part of the plan and to continue to make good the promise we made our men in uniform.

Now this war is like a giant balance. On to one side of the scales the enemy throws the weight of his men and his matériel. Imagine with me that the indicator at the top of the balance points to the time on the calendar.

If you will look at the balance on December 7, 1941—the day of Pearl Harbor—you will see us very badly outweighed indeed.

Much of our fleet was out of action, most of our present Army was still in civilian clothes. We possessed exactly 1,157 airplanes suitable for combat and almost exactly the same number of usable tanks.

Then and there we set about to change the balance—to put the weight of men, and particularly of matériel, on our side.

I should like to tell you a little about the cost of not having the weight of matériel—what happens if the scales are against you for a long period.

The Russians had men but lacked matériel, lacked the sheer weight of arms. According to a report a few months after the turn came at Stalingrad, from June 22, 1941, when Hitler marched against Russia until June of 1943, the Russians paid for their lack of matériel with 4,200,000 killed and missing.

That was an appalling price. It's more than half of our whole Army. It would be nearly fatal to us.

Fortunately, we have not had to sacrifice our manpower while we were building our strength in matériel. Thanks to an almost incredible job of production by American industry, you made fighting matériel as fast as we could get fighting men ready to use it, and as fast as you could build ships to carry the men and matériel to the fighting fronts. When our troops met the enemy they were equipped to fight the war on our terms.

Let's take a good look at that kind of war:

It's on wheels. It's mechanized. It's in the air. It's on the ocean. And everywhere it's in overwhelming strength.

Since it started you have made: 1,800,000 trucks; 68,000 tanks; 2,800,000 big and medium guns; 15,000,000 machine guns and rifles; 43,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition; 43,400,000 bombs; 196,000,000 uniforms; 98,000,000 pairs of shoes of all kinds; 187,000 planes.

Based on any experience any country had ever had in any war, these and the thousands of other things you also made represent a magnificent achievement.

In the opinion of many, they should have been enough, but they are not enough for this war.

General Eisenhower's forces, General MacArthur's forces, General Richardson's forces, General McNarney's forces, are using some parts of the reserves we were able to build up before the fighting reached its present intensity faster than we can replace them.

Where, by reason of the superior mobility which our mechanization has given them, they have been able to discover the enemy's softest spots and where they have been able to hurl more tons against the enemy, they have been able to hurt him worst, advance our cause most, and save more of our own men's lives.

Proof that our kind of war pays off, lies in the men who will come home again as well as in the ground won. At Aachen, for instance, we were able, with the help of a very great concentration of fire from 105-millimeter howitzers and air bombing to capture the town at a relatively low cost in men.

Let me explain what I mean. As our troops moved forward, the town was divided into areas. Each area, just ahead of the troops, was smothered with shell fire to keep the Nazis pinned to whatever shelter they could find. With the lifting of that fire to another sector, our infantry moved forward to kill or capture the Nazis as they crawled out of their shelters.

We saved manpower by taking the town that way. We did not save artillery shells. We didn't try to.

At Aachen alone we fired 300,000 rounds of 105's.

And the same general tactics are working in the Pacific. To date, the Japs have lost over 277,000 men to our 21,000. One American soldier and his tons of supporting matériel to 13 Jap soldiers.

Today, both in Europe and in the Pacific, we are fighting with millions of men in the combat lines instead of the hundreds of thousands of last year and the year before.

There will be many Aachens ahead of us on both fronts; spots where we will throw everything America has at a groggy enemy, never letting him rest, never letting him get his head up day or night; throwing fresh men with fresh material at him from the front while the Air Forces batter his supply lines and factories in the rear.

Until we are heavy enough on our side of the balance to fight such battles with all armies on all fronts, we aren't ready to call the war in the bag.

This is the way, remember, America elected to fight this war. Our generals and our G. I.'s are carrying out the strategy America set for them, and they are doing it magnificently.

In short, industry, labor, the W. P. B., the W. M. C., and the Army Service Forces are on the spot. We, at home, are squarely up against the question of whether American productive capacity can deliver the increased quantity of goods to fight the kind of war America has elected to fight, can deliver these goods wherever they are needed, whenever they are needed, and in whatever quantities they may be needed. When you compare the weight we swing today with what we could muster 3 years ago today, the balance is undeniably shifting.

Had we been able, however, to have reached today's weight on December 6, 1943, we might be celebrating total victory now. Great as is our capacity, it was beyond our ability to do that.

Instead, we are just now coming against the full might of the concentrated weight which a desperate Germany and an even more desperate Japan can use to pit against us.

I will give you a few figures for comparison between our strength in 1942 and in 1944. But don't forget that Germany with its undeniable fiendish skill and efficiency is right now training thousands of fresh troops and turning out millions of tons of equipment for them.

By the end of 1942, we had a little over 1,000,000 Army men overseas; now we have nearly 5,000,000 men overseas—and that doesn't include the Navy, marines and Coast Guard.

The tempo is quickening—the fury more devastating. Our men are using supplies faster. They need new kinds of supplies.

Take the mortar shell, as an example. In north Africa our forces expended 42,000 rounds a month. In France, between September 20 and October 20, the First, Third, and Ninth American Armies alone expended more than 1,300,000 rounds of mortar ammunition. They fired more mortar shells every day than were used in a month in Africa. And there are four other armies fighting on this same front.

The other day a cable requisition came to Army Service Forces Headquarters in Washington from a general in the field. He asked for 80 different types of ammunition, 4,000,000 rounds of one kind; 10,000,000 of another; 5,000,000 of a third, and so on for four closely typed pages. That wasn't the only big ammunition order we were handling on that day, either. Add to the needs of this general those of others in Europe and throughout the world and you get a fair notion of the industrial job ahead of us.

The more weight we can have, when we need it, and where we need it, the sooner we shall be able to knock over Germany and Japan.

It is just a case of simple arithmetic.

More matériel equals fewer casualties, a shorter war.

What weight do we need? We need all the weight we can use. What additional weight must we have right now? How do we stand right now?

Make no mistake about our situation. They have supplies at the front right now. It's the future we must provide for. Our program is not lagging on all items. Even on the critical items many manufacturers are abreast of the schedules we have given them. Further, some of the demands are so recent that you could not be expected to have reached your maximum schedules in the time that has elapsed. That very fact merely emphasizes the urgency of our plight.

It is on these critical items, some of them new ones, that we must concentrate our efforts. Twenty-seven percent of all the programs are in this critical category. It is to this 27 percent we must give our thought and bend our energies. Though individual manufacturers can well take pride in their position if they are on or ahead of schedule, on a broad front we can find no comfort unless these critical shortages are met. For example, though all else may be up to schedule, what good is a truck without tires or a gun without ammunition or, for that matter, 50-caliber ammunition in abundance if ammunition is needed for big guns? We must have balance and to make our problem harder that balance is constantly shifting. We must meet these shifts; we must meet new and unforeseen demands. We must meet them when they are needed and continue to meet them until the last shot is fired.

We have explained our need to our two great labor organizations, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., and both have responded wholeheartedly, with prompt organization of recruiting services to assist us in plugging the holes we need to fill.

Government agencies involved in our production programs, especially the W. P. B. and the W. M. C., are acutely aware of our need. We are in complete agreement as to the urgency of our situation. Together we have outlined the steps we must take.

In a few minutes, Mr. Krug, who I am mighty happy to have in here pitching with me, will discuss these measures and the programs where extra effort is needed today.

I said at the beginning that it was my job also to see that several hundred thousand good American workers understand this problem. Who are these good American workers, over three hundred thousand of them?

They are ex-members of the home front industrial army, or workers who have not yet been in war production at all. They are members of the group of optimists who have already guessed that the war is about over. They have drifted away from the home front army of 10,400,000 war workers. They have taken a furlough or have come to believe their term of enlistment is over.

Over three hundred thousand is the number of additional workers our critical programs need to get up to schedule. We may need more later on.

So, we must reach these men and women now. We must get their help to turn out the weight they can add to the balance.

If every one of these workers decides today to go back to work on the production front this week it won't be long before Eisenhower and MacArthur will feel their support; it won't be long before there will be an upsurge of short items needed on the fighting fronts.

To date, we've had half a million casualties. Thank God not one has been because of short production! But, if we don't throw this extra weight of production into the scales now, right now, we may have to risk lives tomorrow that we never should risk. The lives are those of your sons and your brothers.

You see now what I mean by the importance of this speech.

If I fail, if you fail, if these needed workers fail, we face the justly accusing eyes of the men who are willing to die for us and who ask us only to give them the power to carry the fight to the enemy.

How much is enough?

There cannot be too much weight.

In a little over 3 months after D-day, the First, Third, and Ninth American Armies in France fired 300,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, 4,426,000 rounds of 105's, 1,248,000 rounds of 155's, 3,500,000 rounds of mortar shell. And I remind you again, there are four other armies on this front as well as still others in the Mediterranean and the Orient.

Since October 20, General Eisenhower has asked us for two-thirds of all our present mortar-shell output. Yet, General MacArthur, not to mention the other Pacific and Mediterranean fronts, has used more mortar shells on Leyte than in all his previous actions combined.

I told you earlier of the vast quantities of material you have delivered already. Let me give you another reason why we must make more, and still more.

In 1 month those same three American Armies in France lost from all causes 83 percent of their dump trucks, 50 percent of their mortars, 14 percent of their scout cars, 10 percent of their light and medium tanks. Multiply such losses by 12 months and you can see that our manufacturing output is far from being net gain in the weight we put in the balance.

I have had quite a little to say about the way we are using up the weight of our matériel in Europe—at an ever-increasing rate. We have two wars to fight. We are perhaps not yet in the full fury of the one in Europe. We are certainly not yet full-out against Japan.

You may be looking toward V-day in Europe as a day of let-down, a time to relax. Burn this thought into your minds. It takes more tons, hauled more miles by far, to destroy a Jap than it takes to destroy a Nazi. We will only transfer our energies after Hitler's Germany falls. We may even have to increase our output in many categories of materials. For instance, there are new weap-

ons now being made—weapons I can't tell all of you about—not yet in use in Europe. Those of you who make them, know them. They must be ready in large quantities for the Pacific pushes.

I would remind you that the Jap still has to be driven across half the continent of Asia to destroy him—that this may be necessary even if we conquer all or a part of his home islands first. That cannot be done bare handed.

It will cost us \$71,000,000,000 a year to fight the Jap after Germany is defeated.

We are going to give that war everything we have. We are going to hit the Jap with everything and every man we can get within reach of him; hit him with every ship, every plane, and every ground formation. That is the formula which will bring the most of our men home quickest. That is the only way to cut down the cost in lives and in dollars.

The war against the Jap alone will be the biggest war this country or this world ever fought before the present war.

The \$71,000,000,000 a year which will be expended against the Jap is greater than the value of all goods manufactured in the whole country in its busiest productive peacetime year, 1929.

Within the past 90 days we have had to increase by 25 percent our estimate of the production we believed we would need to fight the Japs after Germany is defeated.

We have more ahead of us today in the war against Japan than we faced in the whole of World War No. 1 in Europe. We will have to ship at least 4 tons to the Japanese front for every ton we shipped to Europe in World War No. 1.

I told you at the beginning that this was the most important speech I have ever made. It is important because I speak in this room to American industry—the greatest industry in the world, an industry that has given sword and shield and buckler to its fighting men. And I speak, through you, to the millions now making war goods so well, and to those 300,000 extra workers you and their fellow workers need tomorrow—today, if possible—in war plants.

It is important because in this room is the power to add weight to the balance, to shorten the war, to save lives.

Because now, this minute, American productive force for the first time may fall our fighting forces.

Because for the first time industry and its workers are not making munitions as fast as munitions are being used up.

Because on all fronts the Allies are pouring on everything they have.

Because our enemies are fighting more desperately than ever before.

Because we planned this war to use up munitions to save men's lives and, with more than 12,000,000 men under arms, with over half of them overseas, we are committed to backing them up with everything America has.

I wish you would pick up your next newspaper and take a pencil out of your pocket.

Turn to the casualty list. Say this to yourself:

"If we could somehow, some way, have thrown in another ton of steel, I could mark a name off this list. If we can supply enough tons, in enough places, we can replace the list with news of final victory." Today all victory leads to is another battle. The final battle is the one we must win.

In closing here today, I want to urge upon you this thought.

As long as the Nation is at war, on one front or two, planning for war, producing for war, fighting the war is the Nation's business and its only business. We must win before we can reap the fruits of victory. You can't beat the gun in this race, and I know you don't want to try to do so.

Our enemies are tough, they are desperate. Their objective was to destroy us. It is still their objective. War is their single purpose. What reason have you to believe that they will not continue to fight? Why won't they defend their homeland with the same, yes even more, desperate fanaticism than they now show on every front.

After Pearl Harbor, we rose in indignation and in wrath. Our objective was to crush our enemies. That is still our objective. And, if we are to achieve it, war until the end must be our single purpose.

After Pearl Harbor, all were imbued with a determination, a selflessness, a high purpose which carried us to peaks of production hitherto undreamed of. From January to August of this year, production then scheduled continued to decline; to decline in the face of the efforts many of us made to stem the tide. During that period, new demands for still more production added to our deficit. Since August, production has again been on the increase. The increase, though not what we would have liked, was gratifying. Since August still other new demands have developed. We must have more. We cannot delay, we must meet these new demands as well as the deficits that have accumulated. We must meet them now.

American industry and American workers must rededicate themselves, here and now, to an upsurge of production on the home front so that our forces on all fronts shall be limited in their use of matériel only by our ability to get it to them and by elbow room on the fighting fronts in which to use it.

The kind of war we shall fight is in the balance. The decision as to the weight we shall throw into the scales is your decision—and this is the time for decision. I know what it will be.

SOCIAL SECURITY: INSURANCE OR DOLE— RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Social Security: Insurance or Dole, delivered by him from Washington, D. C., on December 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to insert the following:

Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pa. and Ohio; from the Ohio River to Struthers in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for this section of waterways, in the report submitted in House Document No. 178, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That compliance with the conditions of local cooperation shall be limited to those features that are usable in this section of the waterway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent agreement. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, By unanimous consent, that on Wednesday, December 6, 1944, at not later than 1 o'clock p. m. the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendment (Beaver and Mahoning River projects) and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I made an extended statement yesterday respecting this amendment. I wish to make an extremely brief one today. This committee amendment presents a proposal which has already been approved by Congress. It does, however, require action in the present form so as to include minor engineering improvements, and an increase in the Federal expenditure by one and one-half million dollars, as recommended by the Board of Engineers in response to the previous request of the Congress. The project's revised cost as a Federal expenditure will be \$38,500,000; its over-all cost will be less than before, being \$42,400,000 instead of \$47,000,000.

The history of this project I gave in detail yesterday. It demonstrates the unflinching approval which it has received whenever acted upon by the Board of Engineers or by a committee of Congress. It has been approved in the several steps of its development by two boards of engineers, by three Chiefs of Engineers; it has been approved twice by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, twice by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. It has been passed once by the House and passed once by the Senate in its previous form.

Finally on its merits, the need and justification of this project is clear. Because of the excessive rail rates, the present charge for transporting coal to Youngstown partly by rail and partly by water is three times what it would be if done all by water; and for the distance where the proposed canal will replace rail transportation, the present rail rates are about seven times what they would be by water. It is an outstanding case of exaggerated rail charges.

The ratio of economic benefits was found to be favorable by the engineers, and today the ratio is substantially stronger than when it was computed by the engineers.

The committee in supporting this amendment asks only that the same public policy be applied to the Beaver-Mahoning branch of the headwaters of the Ohio River as has been applied to its other branches. It is approved by the Committee on Commerce, and I hope the Senate will today approve it as a part of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in discussing this amendment on the floor of the Senate yesterday, I stated that the cost of this project to the taxpayers of America would run to approximately \$70,000,000. The accuracy of that statement was almost immediately questioned by both Senators from Ohio.

In order to clarify the matter, and in order to establish the validity of the figure which I cited yesterday, I quote now from page 2, paragraph 5, of the minority views of the committee which considered this amendment:

The estimated Federal cost of this project is \$38,500,000 and with an annual maintenance charge of \$630,000 for this 35-mile-long dead-end canal. There is a further cost of approximately \$30,000,000 to be borne by local contributions. In all, this project will need \$70,000,000 for construction, and an estimated \$630,000 for yearly maintenance.

Mr. President, I feel that this statement of minority views represents a sound, iron-clad, and comprehensive case against the construction of this proposed project. It had been my intention to discuss a number of these points during the debate today, but in order to conserve the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the minority views dealing with the Beaver-Mahoning project may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the minority views was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Beaver-Mahoning Rivers: This project envisions the construction of a 12-foot channel, 200 to 250 feet wide in the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers in the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania. It was the original intention that this project should connect the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers with Lake Erie, but that idea has been abandoned, at least for the present time. In this bill the project calls for the construction of a dead-end channel from the point where the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers enter the Ohio River, to a point 35 miles north at Struthers, Ohio, in the Youngstown area. The main object of this project is to provide a navigation channel from the Ohio River to Struthers, apparently to enable the large steel companies in the Youngstown area to obtain their coal supply by water transportation, in contrast to the present method of unloading the coal barges at a point on the Ohio River into railroad freight cars, and then hauling by railroad the 35 miles north to Youngstown. The estimated Federal cost of this project is \$38,500,000 and with an annual maintenance charge of \$630,000 for this 35-mile-long dead-end canal. There is a further cost of approximately \$30,000,000 to be borne by local contributions. In all, this project will need \$70,000,000 for construction, and an estimated \$630,000 for yearly maintenance.

In figuring the estimated subsidized water transportation rates as compared with the existing railroad rates, it must be borne in mind that the railroad rates—as pointed out earlier in this report—are based on total construction cost and maintenance of railroad bed and trackage, plus equipment costs and operating charges, whereas the rates on subsidized water-borne traffic are based solely on floating equipment cost and their operating charges.

The minority is reliably informed that the cost of a new double-track railroad from a loading point on the Ohio River up the 35 miles to Youngstown would be between fifteen and twenty million dollars, and it must be evident to all that if the Government built this railroad for this sum and maintained it at an annual cost of not exceeding \$130,000, that some \$50,000,000 would be saved in construction costs as compared with the waterway, and some \$500,000 annually in maintenance costs, and if the railroads were permitted to operate their equipment over this federally built and maintained railroad without any charge, as in the case of the waterway, the per-ton freight rate would be considerably less than that estimated for the water-borne transportation system with positive, dependable operation all the year round.

It must be clearly understood that the signer of this minority report is not advocating the construction of this federally owned railroad, but merely using the suggestion as a comparison to illustrate the inequality of the basis of calculation for freight rates as between the two systems. The member of the Commerce Committee submitting this minority report holds no brief for the railroads, but does hold a brief for the taxpayers of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 22 beginning with line 1.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. WILEY's name was called). I am asked to announce the necessary absence from the Senate on official business of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained. If present these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay." He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—16

Ball	Ellender	Nye
Burton	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Hayden	Overton
Capper	Holman	Taft
Connally	McClellan	
Downey	Millikin	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hall	Reynolds
Austin	Hatch	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Jenner	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Kilgore	Tunnell
Byrd	La Follette	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McFarland	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	Maloney	Weeks
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wilson
Green	Reed	
Guffey	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Gillette	Scrugham
Bailey	Glass	Shipstead
Barkley	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Langer	Tobey
Brooks	McCarran	Truman
Chavez	Moore	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
George	Pepper	Wiley

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

PURCHASE OF LOGS, LUMBER, AND OTHER FOREST PRODUCTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2185) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now consider a bill authorizing the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State. It is rather an urgent matter, and I do not think it will entail any discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it a noncontroversial bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state by title for the information of the Senate the bill referred to by the Senator from Texas.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on

page 1, line 3, after the words "Department of State", to insert "beginning immediately"; and on line 4, after the words "period of", to insert the words "the emergency and not to exceed", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of State, beginning immediately for the period of the emergency and not to exceed 2 years following the cessation of hostilities, two additional Assistant Secretaries of State, each of whom shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve without numerical designation of rank.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The **CHIEF CLERK**. On page 35, after line 23, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the pending amendment. I believe the committee is to be commended for having stricken the language known as the so-called Elliott rider. The question involved is one of fundamental change in the land policy of the United States, which goes back in an unbroken record to the Preemption Act. The action of the committee is in conformity with the action taken by the Senate in regard to matters affecting the irrigation laws in connection with the flood-control bill. Those amendments were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, where they could have the study of the committee which has jurisdiction over such legislation. I believe the Senate feels, in view of that action, that legislation affecting the land policy of the United States, and particularly the portion of the policy designed to maintain and encourage the development of the family-sized farm in the United States, should not be altered or changed or compromised except after the most meticulous consideration and for the most persuasive reasons.

Therefore, I trust that the conferees on the part of the Senate will bear that in mind when the pending bill is in conference.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 35, beginning in line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the next committee

amendment which has been passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

SEC. 4. In connection with dams or works authorized by this act which the Secretary of War determines, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and upon the authorization by the Congress; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and works authorized by this act may be utilized for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of said Federal reclamation laws and this paragraph.

Mr. OVERTON. In lieu of that amendment, I offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute which now lies on the desk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The **CHIEF CLERK**. In lieu of the committee amendment, beginning in line 4, page 36, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 4. Hereafter whenever the Secretary of War determines, upon recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior, that any dam and reservoir project operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works in connection therewith as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws and after subsequent specific authorization of the Congress by an authorization act; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dams and reservoirs operated under the direction of the Secretary of War may be utilized hereafter for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of this section, but the foregoing requirement shall not prejudice lawful uses now existing. This section shall not apply to any dam or reservoir heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the Army engineers, which provides conservation storage of water for irrigation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when the substitute was first offered the other day, I raised some question about it, because it had just been presented from the floor and I had not had an oppor-

tunity to study it. Since that time I have not only studied the substitute but I have conferred with officials of the Bureau of Reclamation. Everyone seems convinced that the substitute is really better than the committee amendment, and that the substitute proposal should be adopted.

However, Mr. President, one slight amendment is desired. It will only emphasize language already contained in the substitute. I call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the following amendment which I now propose: In line 14 of the substitute, after the word "with" insert "the Federal reclamation laws and." That will make that part of the sentence read, "in conformity with the Federal reclamation laws and the provisions of this section."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment. I think it is wholly unnecessary, but there is no objection to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I could not hear what the proposed amendment to the substitute is. Will the Senator from New Mexico be kind enough to state it again?

Mr. HATCH. I point out to the Senator the amendment as it would appear in the bill. It merely emphasizes the first line, but it makes no change.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment beginning in line 4 on page 36.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Lucas in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to the substitute amendment, as amended, to the committee amendment on page 36, inserting a new section 4.

The substitute amendment, as amended, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The next committee amendment which has been passed over will be stated.

The next passed over amendment was on page 37, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 6. Electric power and energy generated at projects authorized by this act and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is not authorized to construct or acquire transmission lines in competition, direct or indirect, with any existing company operating transmission lines for the sale of electric power; except as otherwise authorized by other sections of this act relating to Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as a substitute for that amendment I offer the amendment which lies on the desk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment in the nature of a substitute,

offered by the Senator from Louisiana, to the committee amendment, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment on page 37, beginning in line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 6. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, since I have offered the substitute amendment I have consulted with two or three Senators and with the Department of the Interior. It is desired that an exception be made in respect to the Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am unable to hear the Senator who is speaking.

Mr. OVERTON. I assure the Senator it is not my fault. There is too much confusion in the Chamber.

I was making the observation that since I submitted the substitute amendment a request has come to me from the Department of the Interior and from several Senators to make an exception with respect to the Snake River project and the Umatilla Dam, so that the provisions of this section will apply to all dams, except as may be otherwise provided in this bill in respect to those two dams.

I do not think the substitute amendment offered by me affects the Umatilla Dam and Snake River project, and I have so advised the Secretary of the Interior and the Senators who are interested. However, I have no objection to the suggested modification; and therefore I am modifying my amendment, in the beginning, after "Sec. 6" and before the word "Electric", by inserting:

Except as may be otherwise authorized by other sections of this act relating to Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project,

Then the section as recommended will apply to all dams, except as may be otherwise provided for the Snake River project and the Umatilla Dam.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand the amendment, it means that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary. Suppose the existing facilities agreed to transmit the power at their

regular rates, but the Secretary of the Interior found that by constructing the lines the power could be transmitted for a considerably lesser cost to the consumers. Would he then be authorized to construct a line?

Mr. OVERTON. He could construct transmission lines for the sale of current from the dams at wholesale prices. I do not think there is any particular limitation to that authority, except as contained in the language "wholesale prices." He is also instructed to do so in order to bring about as wide a distribution of electric current and energy as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. And on fair and reasonable terms, I believe.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; on fair and reasonable terms.

Mr. AIKEN. And if any existing line attempted to hold him up on the price for transmitting it, then he would be at liberty, would he not, to go ahead and construct a line himself?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I thought the interpretation would be, and what I hoped it would be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana how the amendment would change, if it would change, the language of the committee amendment on the subject as it is contained in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The language of the substitute would be changed in the form which I have asked to have modified.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I have asked to modify the substitute amendment by inserting after "Sec. 6," the words "Except as may be authorized by other sections of this act relating to Umatilla Dam and the Snake River project."

Mr. MILLIKIN. The exception would apply to the substitute.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. The reason why the insertion was made in the original committee amendment is that otherwise there could be, under its terms, an interference with the distribution of power from the Snake River and Umatilla Dam. My substitute amendment would not interfere whatever, because it would permit the Secretary of the Interior to build transmission lines for the sale at wholesale rates of power generated at the Snake River project and the Umatilla Dam.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment is practically in the language of the one which the Senate adopted with reference to the construction of transmission lines under the flood-control bill, with the exception that the amendment would not apply to the Umatilla Dam and Snake River project. It would carry out the policy provided in the flood-control bill, namely, giving to the Secretary of the Interior the right to build transmission lines where they may be necessary in order to afford preferences to municipalities, public agencies, and farmer cooperatives in assuring a fair and equitable distribution of power

at the fairest and most reasonable rates. I strongly favor the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, the power policy of the Federal Government has not been developed capriciously. It has been hammered out by the Congress in bill after bill relating to the Federal construction of water control and conservation projects and the regulation of interstate streams. The core of that Federal policy is that the benefits of power development at Federal projects shall not be monopolized by limited groups but that those benefits shall be widely distributed. This policy respecting the disposition of the people's power property on the basis of the general welfare has its roots in the earliest history of our country. There were those in the early days who sought to sell the public lands in the public domain to the highest bidder, to the men or companies that could put up the most ready cash. That policy bred land monopoly and the monopolization of the resources derived from the land—both on and under the earth. That policy was repudiated in the homesteading policy of selling our public land and resources for the benefit of the greatest number. Upon the policy of homesteading our Nation has grown big and great and our resources have been kept from being monopolized by the powerful few. Under that policy the Northwest territory, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, the great Middle West was settled—settled by farmers who work the land and reap its benefits.

So, too, with our power resources we have sought to assure that they will not become enmeshed in the empires of the monopolists but that they will be available to develop the industry and agriculture of our Nation and to lighten the burden of the housewife. We have enacted into law again and again a policy of giving preference to public agencies, municipalities and cooperatives in the sale of the people's power resources, developed at Federal dams. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] remarked on Wednesday that the first such preference was started in an amendment to the Reclamation Act in 1906. It was reiterated in vigorous language in the Raker Act in 1913 which gave public lands to the city of San Francisco for use in connection with a water and power development. It has in recent years been enacted in the reclamation laws, in the T. V. A. Act, the Bonneville Act, and the Fort Peck Act. This policy has resulted from the efforts of the Congress to combine the sound tradition of our Nation, to foster business, aid the farmer, and make the benefits derived from Government expenditures available to all of the people.

There are two sound policy reasons for combining this policy of giving preference and priority to public agencies in the distribution of federally developed power and for building the necessary transmission networks to implement that preference and priority and to make it effective.

First, it is sound business for the Government to sell its power to more than one distributor. If the Government is required to sell merely to the one large

utility in the vicinity that can afford to build a line to the Government's dam, that utility will be able to dictate the terms upon which the power may be sold by the Government. It can dictate the price at which the power will be sold. No businessman would want to be in such an anomalous position. No wholesaler in business would want to depend upon a single outlet for the distribution of his product if he would remain in business.

The sale of power through public agencies and nonprofit organizations, moreover, means the sale of more power. It means the fuller and speedier development of the power resources of the Government and the consequently greater repayment to the Treasury of the costs of the projects. It means this because public agencies and nonprofit distributors sell power on a basis that results in the widest use of power and its heavy consumption in the home and on the farm and in the factory. The effect of low-cost power on consumption has been demonstrated again and again. The T. V. A. has given us an outstanding example of the greater use of power through the reduction in its price. Similarly, in the Northwest the results of the low-cost power, at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are shown in the tremendous per capita use of electricity in those areas.

Let me state this in figures. I shall use State averages of both public and private companies so as not to confuse the point I am making that lower costs, whether public or private, means a greater use of power. The average residential use of power in the Nation as a whole in 1943, according to figures from the Edison Electric Institute, was 1,070 kilowatt-hours. The average price was $3\frac{1}{10}$ cents. That is the average use and price throughout the Nation from public and private retailers. In the State of Tennessee, both private and public retailers sold 1,672 kilowatt-hours to the average customer at a cost of $2\frac{3}{100}$ cents. More than half again as much use of power in Tennessee over the average for the country—at less than two-thirds the cost. In the State of Washington, where Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams sell power to both public agencies and private utilities at wholesale over a great publicly owned transmission grid, the average use of power by the domestic consumer is 2,327 kilowatt-hours or more than twice the national average—the cost of power to the consumer is $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents or just less than half of the average national figure. I cite these figures because I think them pertinent to the point that the use of power goes up as the price goes down. A further extension of this point may be found in Winnipeg, Canada, where the average use of power is about five times the average in this country and the average price is about a fourth of our national average.

As long as power can pay a part of the cost of multiple-purpose water developments; as long as our rivers are uncontrolled and lay waste lives and property; as long as navigation and irrigation are needed in the building of America—we must combine the policy of giving pref-

erence and priority to public agencies and farmers' cooperatives in the sale of Federal power. For that sale of power will stimulate greater demand for power that helps in paying for multiple-purpose developments.

The sale of public power through agencies that do not place excessive tolls upon this power before it reaches the ultimate consumer is good business. It means that the Government's power will be sold steadily, and that the Government will receive a constant income. It means further multiple-purpose developments where these developments depend upon additional power installations. As a business proposition, therefore, it would be unthinkable to place the negotiators for the Government behind the eight ball of a policy that would hamstring them and require them to sell through private power companies exclusively, power that public agencies and farmers' cooperatives are eager to buy.

The Government has also launched on a popular and sound policy of lending money to farmers' rural electrification cooperatives to bring the light of our electric-power civilization to the far corners of our rural areas. That policy is sound in peace and in war. The labor-saving devices made possible by rural power have enabled our patriotic American farmers to carry on the greatest food-and-fiber production load in the history of this or any other nation, and to do so with fewer farmers and farm helpers. More than 4,000,000 people have left the farms of this country in the past few years and yet our farmers are producing more necessities of war than ever before. The lowly electric motors—pumping water, milking cows, grinding feed, and carrying forward the other chores of rural living—have helped to make this miracle of production possible.

The loans that have been made to these farmers are paid back—they are a sound business proposition.

But they are sounder if the cost of power to the cooperative is lower. Why should publicly produced power not be made available at cost to publicly financed cooperatives? To do so is sound business. The figures of the Rural Electrification Administration show that the cooperatives bought power cheaper from public agencies than from private utilities. For the Nation as a whole the cooperatives paid an average of $1\frac{1}{400}$ cents per kilowatt-hour for power from private sources, whereas the average cost of public power was sixty-eight one-hundredths of 1 cent. Indeed, the figures of the R. E. A. for 1943 show clearly that by and large the cheapest power was bought from public agencies. For instance, the lowest rate for large cooperatives purchasing more than 3,500,000 kilowatt-hours was from a public agency. It was forty-one one-hundredths of 1 cent. The highest rate for such purchasers was from the Tidewater Power Co. in North Carolina, and the price was $13\frac{1}{100}$ cents, or 219 percent higher.

Bonneville, T. V. A., the Bureau of Reclamation, and other Federal suppliers have given the farmers' cooperatives

power at low rates. This has been good business for the Government both as a power supplier and as a banker for the cooperatives. I would not now want to abandon that sound business policy. The Government's transmission line is like a public highway that brings the benefits of multiple-purpose projects to farmers, to householders, and to businessmen alike. The Senate should accept no amendment that would require that this power be sold over a private toll road. Such a policy would bog down the sale of Government power except to the monopoly operating in the area of the dam. It would not be good business for the Government.

My first reason for our traditional policy of giving preference to public agencies and providing transmission lines to implement those preferences was that it was good business. My second reason is that it is good government. It has been shown to be good government not merely in these past few years but since the earliest stages of public power development. It has been good government throughout the time that Congress has reiterated its position that the people's power should be made available to the people on a basis that will not result in excessive tolls or in the monopolization of the benefits of that power by a favored few.

In the past few years we have seen the concept of the multiple-purpose project blossom out into the sound multiple-purpose development of an entire river basin. I cannot believe that anyone who has seen the results of the comprehensive plan and program of the Tennessee Valley Authority would ever want to go back to the anarchy that prevailed over the waters of the Tennessee River in the past. I cannot believe that anyone who has seen the drudgery of the farmers and the farmers' wives lifted from their shoulders by the advent of rural electrification upon their farms would ever again want to return to the period of kerosene lanterns that prevailed when power companies skimmed the cream of the rural business and left the more isolated farmers to fend for themselves in what was literally the Dark Ages on the farm.

It is good government to provide for the multiple-purpose development of our rivers so that they may carry the commerce of our Nation through their navigation works, so that they may no longer waste the lives and property of our people through destructive floods, so that they may irrigate our arid lands, and so that their falling waters may produce power for the benefit of our people. It is good government to see that all of these benefits are widely spread among our people and that none of them are made the possession of the few. It is good government to see that Federal power is made available throughout the area of its economic transmission—to lower the cost of farming, to lower the cost of running the home, and to lower the cost of making goods and providing services in industry and business.

For in the transmission of its abundant supplies of low-cost power the Federal Government is providing a means

for decentralizing industry and for achieving a balance between the town and country, between agriculture and industrial production. The day of industrial concentration with its slums, its health hazards, its poor living standards, is reaching its twilight. The availability of abundant supplies of low-cost electric power that results from the development of our country's water resources is bringing about a new era of industry scattered throughout the land, benefiting all regions, all groups, all people in our great Nation. Low-cost power is intensifying the effective use of our civilization just as surely as our low-cost public highways extended that civilization. Indeed, the transmission lines that bring abundant low-cost public power to every hamlet are the new highways over which this country will progress and over which the undeveloped regions may reach a fuller use of their manpower and their resources. Yes, it is good government to continue our present sound policies for the distribution of power produced at Federal developments.

Because it is good business and good government to sell Federally produced power in a manner that will prevent its monopolization and that will spread its benefits widely among the people, I am opposed to any amendment that would restrict sales of power to the site of the dams. I favor giving preference to municipalities, public agencies, and farmer cooperatives. Where it is necessary for the Government to construct transmission lines for such preference to be enjoyed, I strongly favor such construction by the Government. I was very much gratified over the action of the Senate in providing for such construction in the flood-control bill and I urge similar action on the pending bill by the adoption of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] in behalf of the committee, in lieu of the committee amendment on page 37, after line 8.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Does that complete the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, within a few minutes I shall have to go to a physician, and I should like to offer several small amendments which would merely authorize surveys to be made on five small streams in the State of Maryland. I should appreciate it if the amendments could be considered at this time and disposed of. No appropriations are asked for. The amendments merely provide for examinations and surveys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Crisfield Harbor, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Bear Creek and Lynch Cove, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, after line 13, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Governors Run, Calvert County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, after line 13, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Channel between Ramsey Bay and Chesapeake Bay, and other measures for the prevention of damage from erosion near the mouth of South River, Anne Arundel County, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment lying on the desk affecting two survey items only, one on the Napa River, Calif., and one on the Noyo River, Calif. I ask that they be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

Noyo River, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 10, after the amendment heretofore agreed to, it is proposed to insert:

Napa River, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to have the attention of the able Senator from Louisiana, I offer an amendment with which he is familiar, and which would remove certain obstacles in the St. Marys River. The amendment is based on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers dated September 18, 1944, which reached us after the Senate Committee on Commerce had concluded its consideration. I am inclined to believe that the able Senator from Louisiana agrees with the amendment and that it will be taken to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. I understand that it is very emergent. I have been so advised by the engineers. So far as I know, there is no conceivable objection to it on the part of anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 14, 1944, and contained in House Document No. 679, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read. I understand that the amendment is not controversial in any way.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment. I know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., with a view to providing a channel to, and navigation improvements at, Leonardo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which would merely authorize a preliminary examination and a survey. It is an amendment about which I have spoken to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and it is perfectly agreeable to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

Columbus, Ga. to Pensacola, Fla.; waterway via Chattahoochee, Conecuh, and Escambia Rivers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment providing for a survey. I have discussed the amendment with the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and he has no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort, N. C., with a view to providing a side channel 12 feet deep through Pasquotank River and Albemarle Sound to Elizabeth City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer two amendments, which I ask to have stated. One amendment pertains to Falmouth Harbor, Mass., and the other amendment pertains to Mattapoisett, Mass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

Falmouth Harbor, Mass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

Mattapoisett, Mass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is not in the Chamber at the moment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, at the end of line 19, it is proposed to change the semicolon to a comma and add "with such modifications, including rearrangement of the harbor facilities and turning basin, as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. I offer a noncontroversial amendment merely authorizing an additional survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 7, page 55, after line 21, it is proposed to add the following:

Nehalem Bay and River, Columbia Slough, Astoria, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a mooring basin for fishing boats within the harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 8. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as can be estimated the amounts of damages resulting to manufacturers on the Oswego River by the improvement of the Oswego and Erie Canals by the State of New York in accordance with the project adopted by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 30, 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

Nissequogue River, N. Y.
St. James Harbor, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. The amendments I have offered merely provide for surveys, and are agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee. I now offer an amendment which is contentious, and I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he will agree to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 11, before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, The United States shall bear the entire cost of dredging and construction of piers at Oak Orchard, N. Y."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I regret very much that I cannot agree to take that amendment to conference. There has been no hearing at all on it. It relates to a certain harbor of refuge on the Great Lakes. There are a number of them, and all of them are required to pay rather substantial sums by way of local contributions because private interests, private docks, and other things are very much benefited by the construction of these harbors.

The purpose of this amendment is to select a particular harbor and strike out all local contributions in connection with it. The amendment was never offered before the committee; no hearings were held on it, and if we should strike out local contributions in respect to this particular harbor we would have to strike out local contributions in respect to other harbors.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if my colleague from Louisiana will yield, I should like to ask him if he would agree to the introduction of a bill and the reference of it to the committee and perhaps ultimately to a subcommittee and later a hearing on the bill at some future time.

Mr. OVERTON. That would be very satisfactory, and I should be very glad to do that.

Mr. MEAD. Very well, I shall withdraw the amendment and offer it as a separate bill.

I now offer another amendment, Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

Channel from Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay, Mass.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk a noncontroversial amendment for a survey dealing with Lake Erie and Lake Huron.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The south shores of Lake Erie and of Lake Huron, with a view to the establishment of harbors and harbors of refuge for light draft commercial and fishing vessels and for recreational craft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. I send to the desk an amendment providing for a survey and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

North Prong, Schooner Bayou, Vermillion Parish, La.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. On behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is unavoidably detained from the Chamber, I offer another amendment providing for a survey. I

wish to say that it relates to the Tombigbee River and the project which the Senate declined to authorize. Now it comes up in the form of authorizing a survey in reference to the Tombigbee River. I do not conceive that there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

Tombigbee River, Ala. and Miss., and canal connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if this amendment were adopted, does the Senator think it would provide the best way to obtain a restudy of the project? Would it be better than a resolution adopted by his committee? They would both involve the same thing; but the Senator can speak with better authority on it than I can.

Mr. OVERTON. One would be as satisfactory as the other.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator think one would be as expeditious as the other?

Mr. OVERTON. I think so.

Mr. HILL. The question in my mind is whether one would be more expeditious than the other.

Mr. OVERTON. I think I can speak for the committee, and if this amendment meets with any difficulty in conference or if there should be no conference at all on the bill—we may never reach that stage; I do not know—I should be glad to aid in getting a resolution for a review through the Commerce Committee.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator thinks we will get a report just as quickly by putting this amendment on the bill as we would as a result of a resolution of the committee asking for a resurvey.

Mr. OVERTON. I think so; that is my opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 23, strike out the semicolon immediately after "1944" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and plans for the alteration of channel alignment on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, with such modifications as he may deem advisable."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] I offer what my colleague from Ohio describes as a noncontroversial amendment. It merely asks for a preliminary examination and survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

Pensacola Harbor, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama in behalf of the junior Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. On behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] I offer another amendment asking merely for a survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

East Pass from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. On behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I offer another survey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

Crystal River, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. On behalf of the junior Senator from Florida I offer another survey amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, 2 or 3 days ago I heard someone say that this very carefully considered bill, the river and harbor bill, which had been the subject of hearings which lasted over a 3 or 4 weeks' period, was not a "pork-barrel" bill. But after listening to the chairman of the subcommittee accept approximately, I should say, 60 or 70 amendments providing for work or studies in as many different parts of the country, without any Member of the Senate excepting the one who was interested knowing what these projects were,

I began to wonder if this was not a good-sized "bacon-barrel" instead of just a "pork barrel."

The Senator from Louisiana has been so kind in accepting the 60 or 70 projects to benefit as many different parts of the country that I hope he will, before I conclude the discussion of the subject which I shall take up, be perfectly willing to accept the amendment which I shall offer, and which might be considered as a good contribution from that "pork barrel" to 135,000,000 people in the United States, and not merely those residing at the mouth of some cove or river.

Mr. President, I shall speak on the river and harbor bill, and particularly on what is commonly known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project, for the construction of which I shall offer an amendment before we conclude the debate on this subject.

I ask that at the beginning of my remarks the amendment which I propose to offer later be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) For the purpose of promoting interstate and foreign commerce and the national defense, and providing an improved waterway through the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, and connecting waters reaching to the Atlantic Ocean, and for the generating of electric energy as a means of financing, aiding, and assisting such undertaking, the agreement made by and between the Governments of the United States and Canada, published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, providing for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and the completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, is hereby approved; and the President is authorized and empowered to fulfill the undertakings made in said agreement on behalf of the United States, and to delegate any of the powers and duties vested in him by this section to such officers, departments, agents, or agencies of the United States as he may designate or appoint. The works allocated for construction by the United States under said agreement shall be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the laws, regulations, and procedures applicable to rivers and harbors projects, subject, however, to the terms and conditions of said agreement.

"(b) The President is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the Power Authority of the State of New York for the transfer to said Power Authority of the power facilities constructed pursuant to this authorization and the right to use the United States share of the waters at the project for hydroelectric power purposes upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon, including provision for payment of \$93,375,000, which represents the cost allocated to power in accordance with the method of allocation included in the joint recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Power Authority of the State of New York dated February 7, 1933, such payment to be made by the Power Authority over a period of 50 years with interest at the rate of 3 percent compounded annually. In addition, the arrangement shall include provisions protecting the interests of the United States and assuring a widespread

equitable disposition of the power to public agencies in other States, including counties, municipalities, public-power districts, and rural electric cooperatives within economic transmission distances, and provisions for the prior use of such water for the purposes of navigation and the delivery, without charge to the War Department, of so much power as said Department shall need for the operation of navigation facilities. The arrangement negotiated pursuant to this section shall not be subject to the provisions of any other section of this act but shall be reported to Congress during its next session, and shall become effective when ratified by Congress and the State of New York.

"(c) When the Secretary of War deems it necessary for the purpose of expediting the construction of this project he may enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding: Provided, That the cost-plus system of contracting shall not be used. The authority to contract contained in this subsection may be exercised through such officer or officers as the Secretary of War may designate. The prior use of all waters of the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the United States and all lands, dam sites, and easements required for the purposes of this section are hereby declared to be necessary for the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in 1941 the river and harbor bill, which was approved by the House committee, approved the agreement which had been entered into by the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to ask, so that I may be advised of the situation, whether the Senator has offered the St. Lawrence seaway amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment has not as yet been offered, and will not be offered until I conclude speaking. I wish to say before I start my remarks, Mr. President, that the proponents of the amendment hope to reach a vote on it as early as we can. There positively will be no attempt to delay the river and harbor bill because of this amendment. I cannot say how long it will take to present our side of the case. I understand there are six or seven Members of the Senate who will desire to speak in favor of it before the debate shall be concluded, but there will be no effort to delay a vote on the river and harbor bill, and we hope to have a vote on the amendment itself just as soon as we can. I make that as a promise now. I say that, because I saw in a news item a few days ago that we would attempt to filibuster. That is not so. I wish further to say for myself personally that if the amendment shall be defeated, there will be no attempt at retribution against any other section of the country on my part, because this is all my country. If we can develop wealth in any part of it, I know it helps my part, too.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. My attention was diverted when the Senator began his remarks, and I could not very well understand what he said. He made some

reference to the senior Senator from Louisiana accepting some 60 or 70 projects.

Mr. AIKEN. Projects or studies, and I remarked that in view of the acceptance of those proposals, I hoped that before we concluded the debate on the St. Lawrence project the Senator from Louisiana would be willing to accept that also.

Mr. OVERTON. I will do so in the same form in which I accepted the others, for a preliminary examination and survey. Ever since I have been in the Senate there has been no objection to an amendment preferred by a Senator with respect to a preliminary examination and survey. It was such amendments that I accepted. They were not project amendments, with the exception of one offered by the Senator from Michigan, which I am going to take to conference, and which is very emergent. There was another which contemplated some modification of an existing project, but that was not a new project.

Mr. AIKEN. I accept the explanation of the Senator from Louisiana. As a matter of fact, the Senator knows that most of the time a Senator sitting on this side of the aisle cannot possibly hear what is being said on the other side.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I shall not ask for a survey of the project at this time, because it has been surveyed and resurveyed, investigated and reinvestigated, for the last 20 years.

As I was stating, the agreement which was entered into by the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, represented the culmination of 10 years of earnest endeavor on the part of our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. After the very kind words which have been said about Mr. Hull on the floor of the Senate, I hope no one will be in a mood to tear down the work which he has been doing and the structure which he has been building over this period.

Mr. President, this is not the first time the St. Lawrence project has been brought before the Congress in connection with the development of the rivers and harbors of our country. In fact, in presenting this project as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill, which I shall do later, I am merely following the procedure which has been followed for the past 40 years. All the works for the improvement of navigation which have involved Canada and the United States, so far as I know, with one or two exceptions, have been authorized through rivers and harbors bills. All the dams across the international boundary waters which have been constructed by private utilities have been constructed in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of 1909.

I would have preferred to have a development of such great importance to the entire Nation come before the Congress as a separate measure. Some time ago, however, I came to the conclusion that such a procedure was without the realm of possibility at this session of the Congress.

I introduced Senate bill 1385 on September 28, 1943, and after giving the Committee on Commerce the full benefit of all doubts which I may have had, I was very reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it would be impossible to obtain a report from that committee in time for any action at this session. The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee have both given reasons to this body for the delay in taking action on that bill. No doubt these reasons seemed plausible to them, and perhaps might have been accepted by me except for certain incidents which have occurred, and which have been discussed at some length on this floor.

I shall not discuss further, unless it is the desire of members of the committee that I do so, the campaign of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana, nor shall I discuss further, unless requested, the explanation of the Senator from North Carolina relating to the delay in requesting reports from various departments of the Government which might conceivably be interested in the bill.

I simply call the attention of this body to the fact that on November 21, 1944, the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce handling S. 1385 started hearings purporting to determine whether it had jurisdiction or not over the bill introduced by me September 28, 1943.

Accepting all other excuses for the delay at face value, the fact remains that it was not necessary for this committee to await the reports of any Government departments before calling hearings to determine whether or not the committee to which the bill was referred had jurisdiction over it. I personally believe that the Committee on Commerce has far outstepped its jurisdiction in undertaking to determine whether the St. Lawrence development is a proper subject for a treaty or an agreement. That, Mr. President, seems to me to be a matter which should be determined by the Senate itself, if at this late date we propose to challenge the form of the instrument negotiated in 1941 by Secretary of State Hull.

I did not testify at these hearings, although invited to do so by both the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, for the reasons that—

First, I make no pretense of being a constitutional lawyer;

Secondly, three members of the committee expressed their decision, according to the press, before any of the testimony was heard;

Thirdly, it was the State Department and not the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway whose right to submit the subject as an agreement was challenged; and

Lastly, I felt that the Committee on Commerce was entirely without jurisdiction to hold such hearings. I understand that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], was not consulted before these hearings were held.

It is doubly unfortunate that these hearings, called for the purpose of challenging the methods of Secretary Hull

and the State Department, were called at the very time when Secretary Hull was ill in the hospital and when Assistant Secretary Adolf Berle, who had assisted Secretary Hull in the St. Lawrence negotiations, was necessarily absent conducting the International Aviation Conference now being held in Chicago.

Therefore, in the light of this most unusual procedure on the part of the Committee on Commerce, it has appeared to the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway development that the only way to secure a vote on this great project, which will directly benefit 50,000,000 people and indirectly benefit every man, woman, and child in the whole United States, is to offer it as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill now under consideration, which we propose to do at the proper time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hall	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Buck	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Langer	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maybank	Weeks
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I stated before I suspended for a quorum call, I should have preferred to offer this bill as a separate measure; but inasmuch as it appeared to be impossible to get a report from the committee in time to obtain any action at this session of Congress, the only recourse seemed to be to offer it as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill, now under consideration, which I propose to do at the proper time.

The action of this Congress in approving or disapproving the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power development will have a far-reaching effect on the position which America will hold in the post-war world. It will be an important factor in determining the extent of the security, the prosperity, and the happiness which the people of this Nation will possess in the future.

It will play an important part in insuring the men in our armed services against the specter of unemployment

when they return to their native land. Those 6,000,000 boys of ours now overseas and the millions who are preparing to follow them are relying upon us to build in this country during their absence the foundation for an era of prosperity and security; and in this we must not fail. We will not fail.

They are doing their part in this war. They are offering all they have. They have left their homes, their parents, their wives, and sweethearts and their children and have gone forward to offer their lives, if necessary, fighting under the American flag in every corner of this earth.

The least we can do is to construct the foundation on which they may build—a foundation which will provide happiness and security for 135,000,000 people, not just for small groups of people presently remaining at home, who do not have to go forth to war, perhaps to nameless graves thousands of miles from their homes.

We have recently authorized tremendous public works in the flood-control bill. We will authorize more in the rivers and harbors bill now before us.

We of the Senate have refused, by defeating certain amendments offered to the flood-control bill, to turn over the heritage of our boys to certain special interests while their backs were turned. I say we can take just pride in the action of this Senate in insisting on holding the remaining natural resources of America in trust for the men and women of our armed services, their families, and their descendants.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to appeal to the members of this body to do one thing more for those who are fighting our battles in foreign lands for us, and that is to authorize the great development which, more than any other, will bring happiness, security, and prosperity to all our people.

Senate bill 1385 approves the agreement entered into between the United States and Canadian Governments on March 19, 1941. That agreement provides for the construction of such works as will furnish a 27-foot waterway all the way from Chicago, Duluth, and other points on the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

Such a waterway would accommodate all but the largest ships of our Navy and our merchant marine, bringing to realization the hopes of the people living in the industrial and agricultural regions of the Great Lakes and the West that some day they will have free access to the seas and their rightful place in the commerce of the world.

In that respect, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the great industrial cities of almost all other countries of the world are located upon waterways—either inland waterways or natural waterways—so that the goods produced in those industrial centers can be shipped to other parts of the world without the necessity of paying expensive transshipment charges which manufacturers located in the central part of our country must bear.

Since the agreement was signed in March 1941, considerable work, including the reconstruction of the locks at

Sault Ste. Marie, has been completed as a war necessity.

The principal obstacle now remaining in the 2,700-mile waterway reaching from the Atlantic Ocean to the ports of Chicago and Duluth, in the heart of our continent, is a 48-mile stretch of rocky channel which is known as the International Rapids. It lies between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

While there are other lesser improvements to be made, the construction of dams, locks, and canals at the International Rapids is by far the major portion of the work remaining to be done. This work is almost wholly on the American side of the St. Lawrence River. The great dam will be entirely within our borders. The canals and locks will be entirely within our borders. Only some of the canal houses and some of the control dams will be in Canada. The work will be done under the direction of the United States Army engineers, and no one questions their ability to do the work.

The total cost of all the work remaining to be done to complete a 27-foot waterway is estimated by the Army engineers to be \$421,000,000. Of this sum, the United States will pay \$277,000,000 and the Dominion of Canada \$144,000,000.

The difference in the amount to be paid by the two countries is due to the fact that Canada has to date spent approximately \$133,000,000, while we have spent only about \$17,000,000, exclusive of certain improvements made since the war started, on this international waterway.

I understand, Mr. President, that this great expenditure on the part of Canada is due to the fact that in 1928 or early 1929, an exchange of notes was made between the Canadian and American Governments, whereby it was agreed—under what authority, I do not know—that if one country spent money in developing the common waterway of value to both countries, the other country would match the expenditure. Canada went ahead on the strength of that agreement, and spent \$133,000,000, principally in reconstructing the Welland Canal so that it has a depth of water of 30 feet over the sills. Therefore, Canada is credited with the amount of \$133,000,000, which has been spent principally in the reconstruction of the Welland Canal, as I have said.

Of the \$277,000,000 to be paid by the United States, \$93,375,000 will be repaid by the State of New York over a 50-year period, to cover the part of the cost properly allocable to the power development which will be constructed in connection with the seaway.

In arriving at the sum of \$93,375,000 which is to be paid by the State of New York, the Army engineers estimated the cost of the construction, then added an allowance of 25 percent for contingencies, and then—on top of that—added 12½ percent more for good measure. This contribution to the cost of the total development by the State of New York is undoubtedly adequate fully to reimburse the Federal Government for all expenditures connected with the power development.

Deducting this contribution from the total estimated cost to the United States, we find a net cost amounting to \$184,000,-

000, plus interest during the construction period. Those two amounts will probably make a total of approximately \$190,000,000.

There is no telling how many days the present war might have been shortened if the St. Lawrence development had been constructed before we became involved in the hostilities.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. If our ships are able to go from ports on the Great Lakes, in the central part of the United States, directly to foreign ports, the result will also be that ships will be able to travel from the industrial centers of other countries to our industrial centers on the Great Lakes, merely upon the payment of the regular fees.

Mr. AIKEN. That is absolutely correct. Any ship will be able to travel from any part of the world to our ports in those areas. A ship will be able to bring rubber from the East Indies or gold from Africa or hides from South America directly to ports on the Great Lakes, without having to unload at the Atlantic ports. Today the cargoes must be transported overland by rail from the Atlantic ports.

In that connection, Mr. President, let me say that at the present time there is a 14-foot canal around the International Rapids, and during this year some 4,000 cargo ships have used that canal. I think the cargoes they have carried have amounted to a total of approximately 9,000,000 tons. I never have reduced that figure to the impressive figures for ton-miles which have been used so freely here, but I think approximately 9,000,000 tons of cargo have been carried this year through the 14-foot canal.

The total cost to the United States of this great development, which will permit ships from the Great Lakes to sail fully loaded to any port on the seven seas, will be less than the cost of waging war for a single day. It will be considerably less than the ultimate cost of many of the projects already approved by the Senate in the flood-control bill and favorably reported by the committee in the rivers and harbors bill.

Previous to the war there was a fleet of Norwegian ships which used the canal to which I have referred. I believe they started with one ship. They were short, shallow-draft ships. The locks of the present canal are only 260 feet in length. Those Norwegian ships had built up a sizable business in carrying freight to Chicago, Detroit, and other ports, reloading at those cities, taking the cargoes to European markets, and selling them in competition with the rest of the world. They were handling manufactured goods largely, as I understand, but just before the war they were carrying considerable quantities of manufactured steel to European markets and selling them there in competition with the world.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator know the nature of the cargo which was brought into the United States in exchange, so to speak, for our own?

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot state. I understand that the ships brought in considerable quantities of pulpwood and other products which we bought from foreign countries. In that connection I believe that if we are to export all over the world we must expect to have cargoes returning to this country. That is one of the things we hope will take place after the war. We hope to have a great increase in world trade.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator has called attention to the amount of money which the State of New York would pay into the fund from which we had invested United States money in the power plants along the river. Can he tell us how much power would be generated in those plants?

Mr. AIKEN. As I have already said to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I will come to that point a little later and go into it in some detail. I am glad, however, that he has raised the question. Incidentally, it might be interesting to know that the total increased capacity of American shipping through the St. Lawrence seaway would be about 10,000,000 tons.

The question of States' rights does not become involved in this bill. The right of the power authority of the State of New York to take over the power development and to sell power therefrom is clearly recognized.

Some years ago I believe it was in either 1933 or 1934—an accord was reached between the Federal Government and the State of New York. It was at the time the great St. Lawrence treaty was before the Congress. The accord was reached and was accepted by the House of Representatives. I believe it was reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and when the treaty failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote, the matter was dropped. But an accord has been reached recognizing the right of the State of New York to take control over the power development and to sell power therefrom.

The bill provides that New York will make available St. Lawrence River power to other States within economical transmission distances. Within 200 miles from where the great dam would be located is an area including the State of Vermont, most of the State of New Hampshire, a part of western Massachusetts, Connecticut, most of New York, and I believe a small portion of northern Pennsylvania. Within the 300-mile transmission distance will be included most of the great industrial regions of the Northeast.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it contemplated that any other power plants will be erected along the route to which the Senator refers?

Mr. AIKEN. Not at the International Rapids. The agreement, which would have to be approved under the bill, also provides "for the preservation and en-

hancement of the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and for the most beneficial use of the waters of that river."

At the present time some of the water which is used at Niagara Falls for generating electric power is very wastefully used. The contract provides that the situation shall be studied, and that experimental construction work may be done in order to determine just how the water from Niagara Falls can be best used. It is estimated that if the water were used efficiently it would result in generating about 700,000 additional horsepower on the American side. I believe the increase on the Canadian side would be about the same, but I am not sure as to that. The power would, of course, be of great benefit to the people living in Buffalo and in other sections of Erie County, N. Y.

That the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has not been constructed long before this time is due to the fact that at every turn special interests have sought to delay and obstruct the improvement, while in certain sections the people have not fully realized what tremendous benefits would be provided by cheap power and reduced transportation costs.

In many instances, franchises were given for the construction by private power interests of dams across rivers lying between the United States and Canada, and the question of constitutionality was never once raised. Now, when it is proposed to construct a dam to be owned by and wholly for the benefit of the public—although I am sure that private power interests would share greatly in the benefits, and probably distribute most of the power generated—questions of constitutionality and other technical questions are raised which were never raised when private companies constructed dams across international boundaries.

The people have been bombarded by propaganda based on absolute falsehoods and half truths telling them that the St. Lawrence development would harm them and attempting to fill them with fear and doubt.

A generation ago a western railroad printed a pamphlet setting forth the savings which would result to consumers on the eastern seaboard through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. I have recently been advised by a friend of the president of that railroad that no sooner had the pamphlet been issued than the president of the road received peremptory orders from Wall Street to gather up and destroy every one of those pamphlets, and under no circumstances to have any more of them printed. I could give the name of the railroad, the name of the president of the road, and the name of the person who ordered the pamphlets to be destroyed; but I do not see that any public advantage would be gained by doing so. We all know that it might be one of a dozen men. We know who those groups are.

For 50 years or more private interests have coveted the mighty water power of the St. Lawrence. In the early days of the development of giant power the generation of public power was almost unknown. Groups of men organized, took

risks, failed in some cases, and made enormous profits in others. Therefore, it was only natural that the St. Lawrence, capable of developing the greatest power on earth, should be the object of many ambitious schemes for private exploitation.

I do not think we can criticize too much the speculative profits made by the privately owned utilities during the early part of this century. The commercial power industry was comparatively new. Many engineering problems were still to be overcome. Those who invested took risks and, as I have said, some lost and others grew rich.

In 1921, a group of the most powerful interests in the United States comprised of the Aluminum Co. of America, the General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co. united under the name of the Frontier Corporation for the purpose of acquiring and developing the power of the St. Lawrence River.

Through Hugh L. Cooper & Co. they made an offer to the United States and Canada that they would construct the seaway without cost to either country in return for the power which could be developed on this great river. The estimated cost of the construction at that time was \$1,350,000,000. This plan of development, however, included that part of the St. Lawrence River which lies wholly in Canada, as well as the International Rapids development which would be authorized by the 1941 agreement.

Some 4,000,000 horsepower of electricity would have been generated on that part of the river which lies wholly within Canada. A portion of it has been developed by private interests. I think the Montreal Light & Power Co. owns it now or did own it a year ago. Last spring the Quebec Parliament enacted legislation authorizing the purchase of the private power plants on the St. Lawrence River and making them into public power plants. But the attempt of the General Electric Co., the Aluminum Co., and the du Pont Co. in 1921 to acquire the title to the St. Lawrence project was the last serious effort by private interests to acquire for themselves in their own name the world's greatest potential source of electric energy.

The offer of these corporations was not accepted, for by that time public opinion was aroused to the point where government could no longer afford to turn over to private interests natural resources properly belonging to all the people.

These efforts to acquire the water resources of New York were first made when Theodore Roosevelt was Governor, and he fought the private interests who tried to acquire them; then Charles Evans Hughes fought them, and finally Al. Smith had to fight them. I think almost every Governor of New York State has had to fight to preserve those resources for the people of New York.

Since that time there has been conducted a campaign by private interests forever to prevent the development of the energy of this great river unless the

benefits of such development are turned over to private interests for private profit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is another project, is there not, for an all-American waterway from the Great Lakes to the ocean?

Mr. AIKEN. I think there were some early investigations that provided surveys for an all-American route, in fact two or three of them, but it was decided that the one now being considered was the only one which was feasible.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Such a route has been very strongly advocated by such organizations as the State Chamber of Commerce of New York, the New York Waterway Association, which was formerly headed for many years by Mr. Peter G. Ten Eyck, formerly mayor of Albany and a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York, and by a great many other American organizations, in contrast to the theory of having a waterway through Canada to be constructed very largely by American funds and employing Canadian materials and labor.

I recall a 5-hour speech made on this floor when the St. Lawrence Treaty, which is really what it should be, was before the Senate in 1933 by the then senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], in which he pointed out the advantages, the many advantages, of the all-American route over the Canadian route.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator from Missouri says is perfectly true; such recommendations have been made, and they have been made, as I understand, by those to whom he has referred; but the investigation made by the committee of which Secretary of Commerce Hoover was the head recommended the St. Lawrence as being the most feasible route. The all-American routes were recommended, I think, for two reasons, the first being that the people of Albany would like to turn all the traffic from the Great Lakes past the port of Albany. That is only natural. The other reason was that the power development would be relatively small and negligible on an all-American route and some of those the Senator has named, as we all know, are very much interested in power development, and I am sorry to say that they have been interested in high prices and scarcity rather than in plenty and low prices.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me a further observation, I hold no brief on the face of the earth for the port of Albany; I do not care anything whatever about the port of Albany; but, as between the port of Albany in the United States and Montreal and Quebec, I stand very strongly on the side of the port of Albany.

So far as power is concerned, that seems to me to be a negligible matter.

My primary objection to this whole scheme is that it puts a limitation in perpetuity on the diversion of water from Lake Michigan, a lake lying wholly within the United States, which diversion is absolutely necessary for the Lakes to the Gulf waterway, which I regard as absolutely essential to the inland waterway development of the United States. It seems to me that power development is an entirely negligible element in this equation.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not desire to enter into a discussion with the very able Senator from Missouri concerning the diversion of water from Lake Michigan, but I understand that the document submitted as a treaty in 1934 absolutely prohibited further diversion of water from Lake Michigan, and it thereby incurred the wholehearted hostility of both Senators from Illinois, whereas the present agreement does not prohibit further diversion from Lake Michigan, but provides a means of settling damages in case it ever is diverted. The Senator's quarrel as I understand is with the States of Michigan and Wisconsin and the United States Supreme Court rather than with this project.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly willing to rest that settlement with the States involved. I think that has been a matter that has been pending before the Supreme Court of the United States for a number of years. What this proposal amounts to is a treaty, and I may say that when the Senator offers his amendment, if he does, I propose to move to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations to be dealt with as a treaty. My objection is to an international agreement—a treaty, or whatever one may please to call it, which, second only to the Constitution, is the law of the land—limiting in any degree whatsoever our right to take whatever water we please from Lake Michigan.

So far as the suits between the various States of the Union are concerned, that is a matter which can be properly settled by the Supreme Court of the United States. They may settle it wrong, but whatever decision they make, of course, will be binding on all of us.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the contract is now before us. It provides that if water shall be diverted, arbitration will be necessary in settling the amount of damage to injured parties on the river.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the Senator's reason for asserting that this is now to be treated as an executive agreement, when it has been recognized for many years as being a treaty?

Mr. AIKEN. The discussion of that matter at this time would be a little premature on my part. I should like to discuss the merits of the seaway and power development itself before engaging with the Senator from Missouri in the discussion of that question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to wait and discuss that question on my motion to refer, which I shall make as soon as the Senator offers his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway, when they found they could not get it in their own name to develop the power for themselves, have resorted to all the tricks of the propaganda world, and apparently have been backed by unlimited funds.

The sordid and oftentimes speculative era of the twenties resulted in gross inflation in the financial structure of so many utility corporations that the term "power companies" was frequently used as synonymous with "crooked business" and "rotten politics."

Holding companies were organized for the purpose of exploiting the public and acquiring unearned profits which ran into astronomical figures. It was not unusual for utility companies to use valuations for rate-making which ran from 10 to 25 times the valuations of the same property for purposes of taxation.

Under such conditions it was naturally impossible, and particularly after the crash of 1929, for utility companies to extend their lines into the rural areas of America because the income from such lines could not pay dividends on the inflated valuations of the capital structure. Only the cream of the market could be served.

Such a condition provided the ground work for the establishment of the R. E. A. and the spread of municipal and public electric systems. Such a condition also provided the incentive for the obstructionist tactics used against the St. Lawrence and other undeveloped natural resources.

If the private utilities could not serve 5,000,000 rural homes themselves, they were apparently determined that no one else should do it. I would except some of the companies from that statement, but there were so many which took that attitude that the public generally applied that state of mind to all.

To my recollection, I have never made a public statement setting forth my views on the public distribution of power. I am usually referred to in the press and otherwise as a public-power advocate. As a matter of fact, I have never at any time advocated the distribution of power to the consumer through publicly owned systems except where it has been impossible to get adequate distribution or fair rates otherwise.

I have most earnestly urged the formation of rural electric associations to serve the millions of rural homes in America which the private utilities either could not or would not serve.

I have fought the private utilities with all the force I had when they have attempted to prevent the transmission of electric light and power to these farms and rural homes, as they have done through tactics which they know only too well how to use.

I shall continue to fight them, if necessary, along this line until every farm home in America receives these benefits to which it is justly entitled.

The utter ruthlessness with which some private utilities have attempted to keep from the farm people of America the ordinary comforts of life have made

it difficult at times for me to be fair to the industry as a whole. There are a million farm homes—yes, probably twice that number—that private utilities never intended to serve, which are getting electricity today because of the competition created by the R. E. A.

Since the St. Lawrence development has again been attracting public attention, I have been told by some private utility operators that if they could be sure that St. Lawrence power would not be used for an expansion of public power lines they would not oppose the project.

I daresay that if we guaranteed that private utility companies could have that power to distribute over their own lines, the St. Lawrence project would go through in short order. The experts whom the opponents hire would be telling a different story when they came before the committee.

My answer to them is that the extent to which public power and cooperative power-distribution system are expanded depends entirely upon the private utility operators themselves. If they are willing, and I know some of them are, to distribute power generated at public plants at a price commensurate with its cost and will be satisfied with normal profits on their business based on fair valuations, they need have no fear of the expansion of public power.

If, however, certain great utility companies and holding companies persist in the obstructionist tactics, the reactionary policies and the ruthless methods for which they have been noted to date, the people of America will have only one recourse, and that is the expansion of public systems for power distribution direct to the consumer.

If they continue with their policy of opposing the construction of plants or the generating of power at public dams or the sale of power at low prices, when that is possible, or if they continue the policy of scarcity and high prices rather than a policy of plenty and low prices, which will mean more jobs, more wealth, more comforts for humanity, they will have forfeited every right to favorable consideration by the American people. So far as I am concerned, the test is here now.

But, it may be said, if I do not advocate the public distribution of power to the consumer, how does it happen I am advocating public ownership of the St. Lawrence and other great sources of power which would supply the low-cost electric current for retail distribution?

My answer is this: God never meant the Niagara Falls or the St. Lawrence rapids, or the rivers of the Tennessee Valley, or Grand Coulee, or Bonneville to be placed here on earth for the benefit of small groups of men. These great natural resources were placed on earth for the benefit of all the people to be held in trust by each succeeding generation for those who will follow. For the highest legislative body in the United States to turn over the water power of any one of these great natural resources to a small group would be nothing less than a betrayal of that trust.

As I have said, the opponents of the St. Lawrence project have resorted to all the tricks of the propaganda world. They have told the coal miners that the development of power on the St. Lawrence would ruin the coal industry.

I think it was John L. Lewis who went before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives 3 years ago and argued against the St. Lawrence seaway, because, he said, the ships which took our industrial goods overseas would bring back coal as ballast, and the more ships we sent overseas with our industrial output the more coal they would bring back. It was an absolutely ridiculous assertion to be made by anyone claiming to represent the coal miners that we should not do more foreign business because we might import more coal. As a matter of fact, if every ton of American traffic which would come through the St. Lawrence Canal were coal and nothing else, I believe it would amount to one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the output of the coal industry of this country, or some such ridiculously small figure. Such a statement, that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway would be detrimental to the coal miner and the coal operator, is at variance with the facts, as has been amply proved in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, where the use of coal increased 1,000 percent following the development of the water resources of that region.

It is true that the use of coal has fallen off nationally during the last two decades, largely due to the increased use of oil. In those areas where cheap electric power has been developed the use of coal has actually increased.

Cheap power means more industry, more jobs, and more wealth. These things mean an increase in the amount of coal consumed. The claim that an increase in industry in any State will reduce the consumption of coal would be so utterly ridiculous as to be unworthy of notice if it were not for the fact that through propaganda methods thousands of coal miners have been led to believe that coal mining really would be injured by the development of the St. Lawrence River and consequent increase in our industrial output. As a matter of fact every reduction in the cost of transportation that brings the coal miner's food to him at less cost means that he is better off, and when in the production of goods which are brought to him at less cost more coal is utilized, his betterment is twofold.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator where the coal would come from that would be transported down the St. Lawrence in competition with the coal mining industry of this country. I did not understand what the Senator said about that.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would come from Britain. Canada imports some coal from Britain, and the Senator from

Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] says also from Russia. I presume he is correct. But if the entire capacity of the St. Lawrence were devoted to the importation of coal it would amount to only a fraction of 1 percent of our total production. In fact the claim is made by proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway that it would permit more of our coal to be sold. I think there is significance in the fact that the city of Lorain, Ohio, which is the largest coal shipping port on the Great Lakes, as I understand, is officially on record as favoring the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Opponents of the seaway have sought to divide the people of this Nation against themselves. They have told the people of the Atlantic and Gulf coast ports that an increase in agriculture and industry and employment and purchasing power throughout the great central portions of our country would reduce the amount of business done by those ports.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Even now with \$10,000,000,000 of lend-lease exports, the total export business of the United States amounts to only 8 percent of our total economy. It may be of interest to note that as far back as 1920 the export business of this country amounted to 12 percent of our total economy, whereas now, including lend-lease and all, it is only 8 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator state that the entire national volume of export trade decreased from 12 percent in 1920 to 8 percent at present, including lend-lease?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but in 1920 our total national economy amounted to \$70,000,000,000, compared with one hundred and fifty-eight or one hundred and sixty billion dollars today, so even though there has been a decrease in the percentage of export, there has been an increase in the dollar amount. I simply called attention to the decrease in percentage.

Most of our business is done with ourselves. Yet, the people of Baltimore and Philadelphia and New York and Boston and New Orleans and Mobile are told that the development of the St. Lawrence, which will make it easier for them to do more business with the people of Buffalo and Cleveland and Toledo and Detroit and Milwaukee and Duluth, is going to hurt them. Those people are afraid today. They do not want to change their ways of doing business, but they comprise only a very small segment of our total population, and I maintain that even though a few might have to change their ways, we should consider this subject in the light of what is good for 135,000,000 people rather than what may be good for 135,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the question of the relative value of the St. Lawrence development, and whether the balance

sheet finally becomes a liability or an asset, I cannot help but constantly think of what happens in the city of Detroit. When the great automobile industry of Detroit can reach the world with tide-water transportation it is perfectly obvious that the industry of that area and everything related to industry, transportation, and everything else, is certain to be served in a degree which multiplies the total economy of the area and the total economy of the country, and it could not have any other result.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observation, and I will add that when the products of the motor-car companies of Detroit reach the markets of the world in greater quantities there will be an increased benefit to every State in the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield to permit me to say a word on that point?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Furthermore, since we are constantly warned that the post-war economy of the world has got to produce a freer flow of commodities pro and con, exports and imports, it again, it seems to me, becomes an axiom that the development of a transportation facility of this nature which is so inevitably sure to facilitate exports and imports must be of fundamental service not only to the economy of the United States but to that of the world.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct.

I readily admit that a few people in this great Nation of ours will have to change their ways of doing business when the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed. But I hold that the easier it is for people of one part of this Nation to do business with the people of every other part of this Nation, the greater wealth and prosperity and security will redound to all.

If the special interests, the apostles of scarcity and high prices, who today are fighting the St. Lawrence seaway would have their way, the United States would soon become a stagnant and decadent nation. As I have said, they fight this proposal because they are afraid of a change.

There are many reasons why we must not permit the selfish interests opposing the St. Lawrence development to delay it any longer. They have done damage enough already.

We have known for 20 years that we needed the St. Lawrence development. We needed it in 1934 when the Senate failed to cast a two-thirds vote in favor of the treaty which was then before the Senate. We needed it just as surely as we should have known that sooner or later we would have to provide for the defense of this Nation, in a world at war, and that we would need battleships and airplanes, power, and aluminum plants for war production.

We knew that the St. Lawrence navigation and power facilities were needed in 1940 and 1941. The supporters of the seaway knew it and the enemies of the seaway knew it.

Those who sought to protect monopoly privileges and profits through postponing its construction knew that it was a vital necessity to this country in the event of war as well as in times of peace. In 1941 the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and virtually every high Government official, pleaded with the Congress even while the clouds of war gathered on the horizon, to authorize this development so that its resources would be ready for the defense of America.

Let me quote now from the statements which some high officials made at that time. I have first the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, a member of the War Production Board, who said, on June 18, 1941:

What a great boon it would have been to national defense now if when this project was first proposed it had been agreed to and put into effect. If that had been done it would not have been only along the 12,000 miles of coastline that we now have scattered our shipyards for building combatant ships, but it would have been along additional thousands of miles of inland waters, completely safe from any dangers from without, where we could be building cruisers, destroyers, submarines right now * * *

It is driven home to me * * * that we are going to live in a disturbed world for a long time, no matter what the outcome of the war may be, and in that world which is out of balance and struggling for a new and secure footing the control of the seas is going to be of immense importance.

Along with the development of modern sea power has come a new power—that of the air. To have a region in a time of turmoil and disturbance and of possible threatened war, where we could proceed with reasonable security in maintaining that predominance in sea power, which such a state of the world might require, would be an immensely invaluable national asset. * * *

The other phase of shipbuilding, which is under pressure, is the construction of merchant vessels. For this type of vessel there are a number of very well organized, efficient yards in the Great Lakes. * * *

If I could be sure, say 2 years hence, that a deep waterway, which would accommodate a vessel 500 or 600 feet in length with a draft of 20 to 25 feet, would be available, the Navy could utilize the Great Lakes yards as well as the coast yards, which would provide a means of promoting ship construction and distributing this work. The work is now confined as you know, to a narrow strip along the coasts. If we could establish this means of communication to salt water we would insure a future means of construction which would be a very marked military advantage to us. (Vol. I, pp. 95, 96, 97, hearings.)

That was testimony given by Secretary Knox on June 18, 1941, before we had entered the war; and even at that time, although there was disagreement in the Congress and very strong disagreement in the country as to what America should do about the war and how she should do it, yet we all knew that we should be preparing for it.

This is the testimony of Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, on June 17, 1941:

The engineers inform me that the project can now be built in 4 years, and possibly in 3 working seasons. * * *

So far as the benefits to this country at this time of emergency are concerned, as I

see them in my Department, they are: First, the increase in our shipbuilding capacity by taking in the shipbuilding capacity on the Great Lakes; second, so far as transportation of munitions to Great Britain is concerned, there is a slight improvement, comparatively, in the distance which such munitions could be transported on a protected route. * * *

Third. The great advantage is the fact that this waterway will produce an estimated total horsepower of 2,200,000. Now, that is a very important matter at this time of strain.

This horsepower produced by this proposed project is, I am informed by the engineers, the largest block of undeveloped power at one site in the United States, as well as the cheapest in its operation.

Speaking generally, it takes advantage of this enormous reservoir constituted by the five Great Lakes, of water power, and produces in the St. Lawrence River a flow of water which is steady throughout all seasons and does not have to be supplemented with steam power, and is, therefore, the most cheap to operate. * * *

Benefit in transportation, whatever the immediate disturbance that may be produced, ultimately inures to the benefit of the entire people of the country and to me it seems inconceivable that when we take into consideration the long view, that we should not have the benefit of this great possibility of cheapened transportation and increased power.

That statement by Secretary Stimson will be found in volume I, pages 4 and 5, of the hearings before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. President, I have read statements by Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson, statements which came to naught. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. I shall not read all of that statement. I read an excerpt from Admiral Land's statement:

There can be little doubt but that the projected seaway would benefit oceangoing transportation in merchant vessels in both the foreign and domestic trades, since the seaway would open to such vessels thousands of miles of additional coast line and would permit them direct access to one of the most highly industrialized and agriculturally prolific regions in the United States.

The Commission is constantly studying how to use to the maximum for defense the shipbuilding resources of the country. There are many shipbuilding sites and prospective supplies of labor in the Great Lakes area not now fully utilized. Temporary expedients are being devised to utilize some ways on the Lakes to build ships to be floated down the Mississippi River. The construction of the St. Lawrence waterway will make possible a much greater use of the Great Lakes yards and will add to our national shipbuilding resources capacity to build large ships now landlocked from the sea. The sooner the St. Lawrence waterway is built, making the lake yards directly accessible to the sea, the more rapidly can the vast fleet of ships disturbed world conditions make necessary be secured.

That is the statement which Admiral Land made before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on August 6, 1941. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement printed in the *RECORD* at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, August 6, 1941.

HON. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: You have requested the views and recommendations of the Maritime Commission with respect to H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

Section 1 of the bill would declare the approval of Congress of the agreement made between the Governments of the United States and Canada published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and the completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, and would authorize and empower the President to fulfill the undertakings made in that agreement on behalf of the United States. The section would further direct that the work allocated for construction by the United States under the agreement shall be undertaken immediately under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the laws, regulations, and procedures applicable to river and harbor projects, and that such work shall be diligently prosecuted with a view of making essential facilities of the projects available for national defense uses at the earliest possible moment.

Under the terms of section 2 of the bill, the President would be authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the power authority of the State of New York for the transfer to such power authority of the power facilities constructed pursuant to the authorization and the right to use the United States share of the waters at the projects for hydroelectric-power purposes upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. The arrangement would include provisions protecting the interests of the United States and assuring a widespread equitable disposition of the power to domestic and rural consumers within economic transmission distances, and provisions for the prior use of such water for the purposes of navigation and the delivery, without charge to the War Department, of so much power as the War Department shall need for the operation of navigation facilities. The arrangement negotiated pursuant to this section would be reported to Congress upon the convening of its next session, and would become effective when ratified by Congress and the State of New York.

Section 3 would authorize the Secretary of War, when he deems it necessary for the purpose of expediting the construction of the project, to enter into contracts without advertising or competitive bidding. The cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting would be forbidden, but the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract would be permissible when such use is deemed necessary by the Secretary of War.

The concluding sentence of section 3 declares the prior use of all waters of the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the United States and all lands, dam sites, and easements required for the purposes of the act to be necessary for the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce.

The feasibility of a waterway to accommodate oceangoing vessels, plying between midcontinent, Atlantic coast, and world markets has been under consideration by both the United States and Canada at various

times during the past half century. Interest in the project has been considerably increased in recent years because of the hydroelectric power potentialities of the St. Lawrence development. The President, in his message of June 5, 1941, recommending authorization of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in the interest of national defense, places the generation of electric power on a parity with the transportation facilities of the project.

Extensive surveys have been made over a period of many years by various departments and agencies of the Government to determine the feasibility, potentialities, and cost of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power development. The results of these studies have been reviewed and correlated, and their data brought down to date in the St. Lawrence survey recently undertaken and now nearing completion by the Secretary of Commerce.

The Maritime Commission has reviewed those portions of the St. Lawrence survey that have been published, with particular attention to those phases of the study which pertain to the activities and responsibilities of the Commission under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and related authority for emergency maritime programs.

Much of the statistical data contained in part II of the survey, on Shipping Services on the St. Lawrence River, is available to the Maritime Commission by reason of its own studies, and some of the data in that part of the survey was supplied by the Commission, as indicated in the survey.

The conclusions drawn by the survey from its studies on shipping services on the St. Lawrence River are considered by the Commission to be conservative and sound. As set forth on page 6 of the letter of submittal, they are:

"On the basis of all the facts contained in this report, the survey draws the following conclusions from its study of the conditions and limitations of navigation on the St. Lawrence seaway:

"1. The development of the upper St. Lawrence to a depth of initially 27 feet would provide a satisfactory waterway 2,350 miles into the heart of the North American Continent. Over this distance there would be only 67 miles of canals, 8 miles of restricted channels, and 18 locks.

"2. Though by no means as unencumbered as shipping on the high seas, yet the conditions of navigation on the St. Lawrence are not so difficult or hazardous as to make extensive utilization impossible.

"3. The season of navigation, though restricted, is not so short, considering the length of revenue-producing operations permitted, as to make the St. Lawrence route unattractive to shipping lines.

"4. There are, in normal times, enough ships of required draft to navigate a 27-foot channel as proposed. In the light of the factors here cited, it can be confidently expected that there will be enough ships able to navigate from the ocean to the Lakes to take care of available traffic.

"There are, then, no physical or climatic reasons why the St. Lawrence route should be unattractive to shipping lines a good part of each year."

According to the plan, the seaway would have a depth of 27 feet, extending from Montreal through the Great Lakes. The situation with respect to the capacity of the seaway to accommodate oceangoing vessels is summarized below.

On December 31, 1939, the world's ocean-going fleet of merchant vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over comprised 9,161 ships, totaling 52,000,000 gross tons. Of these vessels, 1,296 were under the American flag, a total of 7,800,000 gross tons. The proportions of these vessels (fully loaded), by groups, drawing 25 feet or less appear in the following tables:

Type of vessel	Total number	Total gross tons (millions)	Vessels of 25-foot draft or less	Percent of total vessels	Gross tons, 25-foot draft or less (millions)	Percent of tonnage
WORLD FLEET						
Freighters.....	6,043	30.0	4,541	71	17.7	59
Combination passenger and freight.....	1,202	10.8	563	47	2.9	27
Tankers.....	1,556	11.1	341	22	1.36	12
Total.....	9,161	51.9	5,445	59	21.96	42
UNITED STATES FLEET						
Freighters.....	802	4.07	519	65	2.27	56
Combination passenger and freight.....	141	1.22	76	54	.42	34
Tankers.....	353	2.59	46	13	.21	8
Total.....	1,296	7.88	641	49	2.90	37

The foregoing table is based upon the vessels being fully loaded. It has been estimated that the preponderant proportion of vessels transiting the Panama Canal is comprised of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity. Allowing an additional 8 or 9 percent of the total dead-weight capacity for fuel, water, and supplies a load of 75 percent of dead-weight capacity would appear to

constitute a reasonably accurate and effective yardstick for practical purposes.

Even allowing for an additional 8 inches, the difference between immersion in salt and fresh water, it is estimated that vessels with loaded drafts up to 27 feet loaded to 75-percent capacity on a weight basis could use the proposed seaway. The table would then read as follows:

Type of vessel	Total number	Total gross tons (millions)	Vessels of 27-foot draft or less	Percent of total vessels	Gross tons, 27-foot draft or less (millions)	Percent of tonnage
WORLD FLEET						
Freighters.....	6,403	30.0	5,724	89	24.7	82
Combination passenger and freight.....	1,202	10.8	804	67	5	46
Tankers.....	1,556	11.1	931	60	5.4	49
Total.....	9,161	51.9	7,459	81	35.1	68
UNITED STATES FLEET						
Freighters.....	802	4.07	728	91	3.5	86
Combination passenger and freight.....	141	1.22	97	69	.6	49
Tankers.....	353	2.59	220	62	1.4	54
Total.....	1,296	7.88	1,045	81	5.5	70

On the same basis, the vessels constructed by the Maritime Commission, in both the long-range and emergency programs, with the exception of the *America* and the tankers, would be able to utilize the St. Lawrence seaway.

Part V of the survey is devoted to the St. Lawrence seaway and future transportation requirements. Since this portion of the survey is concerned with the probable effect of the seaway upon other modes of transportation, principally the railroads, no critical comment is offered on the conclusions contained in it. Inasmuch, however, as the progress and development of the American merchant marine are intimately related to the future transportation needs and services of the Nation, the following observations are deemed pertinent:

Twice within 25 years experience has demonstrated that the needs of our national defense for a merchant marine capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency call for more merchant vessels than have been built by American operators for use in commercial traffic in time of peace.

Present plans for the development of a two-ocean Navy accentuate this problem. An expanded Navy will be severely crippled unless the merchant marine is able to provide it with auxiliaries in time of emergency. This means that a great expansion of the merchant marine is also necessary.

The problem is to maintain, in normal times through the absorption into normal domestic and foreign commerce, a merchant fleet adequate to the needs of national defense.

In 1914 less than 10 percent of the value of our export and import trade was carried in American vessels. The withdrawal of ships from our commerce at the outbreak of World

War No. 1 created severe transportation shortages. The entry of the United States into that war brought on a gigantic shipbuilding program—nearly \$3,500,000,000, for more than 3,000 ships, of 18,500,000 gross tons.

After the war the effort to assimilate our newly constructed merchant vessels into the commerce of the Nation, and to make an effective merchant marine of them proved difficult and complex in the extreme. Nevertheless, at the end of 10 years, in 1929, 33.4 percent of the value of our foreign commerce was carried in American bottoms.

The long-range replacement program of the Maritime Commission, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, got under way in 1937. The program called for the construction of 50 ships a year for 10 years. The outbreak of World War No. 2, and the menacing aspects of that spreading conflagration, have resulted in the acceleration of the long-range shipbuilding program of the Maritime Commission under the 1936 act, and in the inauguration of an additional emergency program for the construction of merchant ships to serve our own commercial needs and national defense and to promote the national defense through aid to nations resisting aggression.

No one can foresee with accuracy the conditions that will exist when the present hostilities cease. World conditions, however, have placed beyond question the importance to the United States of maintaining access to the seas. Such access can only be assured through the maintenance of a powerful navy, served by an adequate merchant marine.

When the present hostilities cease, it will again be necessary to provide for the assimilation of an expanded merchant marine into the normal commerce of the country. Since the ships needed for naval and military aux-

iliaries in time of war or national emergency can only be maintained in normal times by absorption into the Nation's foreign and domestic commerce, it is evident that any opportunity to provide for the expansion of the use of merchant vessels in normal trades is worthy of serious consideration.

This is particularly true in the domestic trades. Vessels serving coastwise and intercoastal routes accounted for 64 percent of the number and 60 percent of the tonnage of the vessels (1,000 gross tons and over) in our merchant fleet in 1939. Thus, the domestic trades normally represent nearly two-thirds of our water-borne transportation. Sound planning for the expansion of our merchant marine must therefore include the further development of water-borne transportation in the coastwise and intercoastal trades.

Although vessels engaged in the coastwise and intercoastal trades are protected from foreign competition by the coastwise laws (and therefore are not included in the subsidy programs of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936), the operators have had difficulty in maintaining their services in recent years. Virtually all of the vessels engaged in those trades (before the recent withdrawal as well as at the present time) are obsolete or approaching obsolescence. No means are in sight at the moment for the orderly replacement of these vessels by new construction, although such a replacement program should be undertaken as soon as emergency needs will permit.

While the foregoing review sketches the over-all problem of the development of water-borne transportation, it is evident, as heretofore noted, that any opportunity to provide for the expansion of the use of merchant vessels in normal trades is worthy of serious consideration. There can be little doubt but that the projected seaway would benefit oceangoing transportation in merchant vessels in both the foreign and domestic trades, since the seaway would open to such vessels thousands of miles of additional coast line and would permit them direct access to one of the most highly industrialized and agriculturally prolific regions in the United States.

The Commission is constantly studying how to use to the maximum for defense the shipbuilding resources of the country. There are many shipbuilding sites and prospective supplies of labor in the Great Lakes area not now fully utilized. Temporary expedients are being devised to utilize some ways on the Lakes to build ships to be floated down the Mississippi River. The construction of the St. Lawrence waterway will make possible a much greater use of the Great Lakes yards, and will add to our national shipbuilding resources capacity to build large ships now landlocked from the sea. The sooner the St. Lawrence waterway is built, making the lake yards directly accessible to the sea, the more rapidly can the vast fleet of ships disturbed world conditions make necessary be secured.

In the meantime to any extent that the long-range naval construction program permits the use of the lake shipyards, thus freeing coastal facilities, to that extent cargo-ship construction in coastal yards can be accelerated.

In view of these considerations, and in the light of the exhaustive analyses of the St. Lawrence survey, which indicate that the great preponderance of expert opinion attests the feasibility and value of the projected development, the Maritime Commission favors the proposed legislation.

This report has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Commission is now advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, Chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to distract the able Senator from his address. However, I am wondering if he has any further comment or observation to make relative to whether this project is to be accomplished by treaty or by agreement. A few moments ago the Senator stated that in 1934 the treaty did not receive a two-thirds vote in the Senate. I am very much interested to know whether the able Senator has any observations to make on the question whether this development can be accomplished by agreement rather than by treaty.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I am absolutely satisfied that the agreement is satisfactory. I agree with former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. I do not, however, wish to discuss that matter at this time. I wish to present the merits of the St. Lawrence development itself, and then I rather presume there will be a discussion as to whether it should be done by treaty or agreement. However, I wish to have as many Senators as will listen realize the tremendous benefits of this great project before we take up any other phase of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me read the statement of William S. Knudsen, lieutenant general, United States Army, Director of War Production, War Department, and member of the War Production Board. This statement was made on July 2, 1941, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives. It is found on pages 813 to 830 of the hearings:

Warfare today is mainly a matter of production of mechanical equipment. No war can be carried on without it, and the power that has the predominance of mechanical equipment has the advantage in the field. So we need production and we need ships to carry the material in. * * *

I believe it is a mistake to have an area like the Great Lakes landlocked, limiting the size of ship you can take out. * * * I believe we should have full access to that great area of skill and material.

When it comes to power, I don't believe we will ever have power enough in the United States.

Hydroelectric power has its advantages. While the first cost is heavy, it is cheaper to produce. Nobody can produce steam power at the cost of hydroelectric power, and wherever it is available, it seems to me, we ought to take advantage of it. There would still be room for the use of all the steam power we could make. * * *

Our defense industries are in constant need of more power. * * * We need power for manufacturing; we need power for domestic use, and wherever we can obtain such power at low cost, I think we should take advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that while Mr. Knudsen, who knew what he was talking about, was pleading for the construction of this great development because we did not have power enough, the opponents of the St. Lawrence waterway development were insisting that we did not need more power, and that we had more than we would ever use.

Continuing with the Knudsen statement:

Many of our defense plants are located right around where this power is to be gener-

ated. It is no secret that in the last aluminum expansion we had to arrange for a certain amount of power to be piped over from New York City, after we could not get any more from Canada. I tried to inquire in Canada whether we could get more and they said, "No; we have none to spare; it is all allocated." So there is going to be a demand for power in the United States. Even after the emergency is over, I think there is going to be a greater demand for power, and I think that any investment you can make in power for the future is a good investment for the United States and for the future of the United States.

To show how truly Mr. Knudsen knew what he was talking about, I call attention to the fact that the great aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., employing 3,500 persons, recently closed down because it did not have sufficient power to operate; and yet there is 2,000,000 horsepower running by that plant, absolutely unharnessed except for a small diversion which the aluminum company itself takes out of the river.

After Mr. Knudsen's testimony Mr. CARTER, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and one of the bitterest opponents of the seaway, for reasons which I do not know, said—

Your contention, then, is that the steam plants could not be built; is that it?

Mr. KNUDSEN. No, sir. A steam plant can be built at any time.

Mr. CARTER. And they can be built quicker than this project can be completed; is that right?

Mr. KNUDSEN. If that amount of steam power was to be generated, I don't believe it could be produced in that time. There are about 1,640,000 kilowatts, I understand.

Mr. CARTER. Is there a shortage of power in that area at the present time?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

I feel our way of living, our standard of living, demands that we do more and more to have power perform the work now done by manpower. I think power is progress. Power makes for a better standard of living. I am not a power engineer, nor can I pose as a power expert, but I bought a great deal of power during my 20 years with General Motors, and my 10 years with Mr. Ford. Whenever I bought water power I got it cheaper than I could get steam power, even if I generated that steam power myself.

Mr. ANGELL, another member of the committee, then said:

Production of aluminum requires large bodies of electric power?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir. In the production of aluminum, the main factor is electric power.

Mr. ANGELL. And this project has your endorsement for one reason, because it does have the possibility of power coming in later?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

That is what Mr. Knudsen said to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941.

Mr. President, I have before me testimony from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, before the same committee, in 1941. I will read only an excerpt from his testimony. During the course of his remarks, Mr. Jones said:

We cannot have too many inland waterways, both in the interests of agriculture, trade, and industry, and for national defense. The value of the St. Lawrence project as a defense measure cannot be too strongly stressed, and I am not thinking just of the immediate emergency, although that, of course, is vital. Regrettable as the thought

of war is, recent developments make it imperative that we be prepared to meet it on any basis at any time. And no time should be lost.

That is what Jesse Jones told Congress on June 23, 1941. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of Commerce has been engaged for over a year in an extensive study of the St. Lawrence navigation and power project. * * * In conducting this investigation the Department has had the cooperation of many agencies of the Government, among others the United States Maritime Commission, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department, the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor. The survey has considered the navigational aspects, the economic and commercial phases, the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes, and the relationship of industrial development to low-cost electric power.

As a result of these studies, the experts of the Department of Commerce have found that extensive commercial navigation through the proposed St. Lawrence route is wholly feasible. * * *

The survey of the power requirements in the New York State area indicates that the power is needed and would in any event soon be absorbed in the industrial progress of this region. Power to meet defense needs at this time and for any possible recurring emergency is of course vital.

As a means of commercial intercourse, just as the Panama Canal linked the east and west coasts, the St. Lawrence route would link the Middle West with the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the west coasts.

This enterprise, in my opinion, should be considered in relation to its importance to the Nation as a whole, just as power dams and other waterways have been considered. We develop and maintain inland waterways and intercoastal canals. * * * While each of these is of importance to its particular locality, they are also important to the Nation as a whole. * * *

We cannot have too many inland waterways, both in the interests of agriculture, trade and industry, and for national defense. The value of the St. Lawrence project as a defense measure cannot be too strongly stressed, and I am not thinking just of the immediate emergency, although that, of course, is vital. Regrettable as the thought of war is, recent developments make it imperative that we be prepared to meet it on any basis at any time. And no time should be lost.

It is the Department's conclusion, therefore, that the project should be undertaken. * * *

Regardless of what happens in the immediate war, it seems if we do not make up our minds that war is apt to recur at any time, then I do not think we are smart. I can see nothing except a future, in the lifetime of those of us who are now living, and probably more further on, than a war-torn country or at least a country in a world susceptible to war at any time. * * *

Mr. CULKIN. From your examination of the bill, Mr. Secretary, you, of course, find that New York State participates in the cost of this project to an amount of \$93,375,000. You have viewed the national picture from an economic standpoint more closely, I think, than any man in the country. * * *

What I wish to inquire of you, Mr. Secretary, is as to the present financial status of New York State and its ability to carry out any of its promises.

Secretary JONES. Is that a question?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Secretary JONES. You mean, what do I think of the ability of New York State to carry it out?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Secretary JONES. I think it is ample.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on December 3, 1943, Mr. Jones appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The following colloquy took place between him and myself.

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Jones, what are the arrangements with the Aluminum Co. of Canada, with regard to the output of the Shipshaw development? Do we have the contract there for over a period of years, and if so, for how long and at what price?

Secretary JONES. Yes; we bought a total of 1,370,000,000 pounds from the Aluminum Co. of Canada—about 600,000,000 pounds have been delivered. It is being delivered at the rate of about 40,000,000 pounds a month, and should be completed in 1944, maybe just a little in 1945.

That was last December.

I continue to read the testimony:

Senator AIKEN. As I understand it, there have been substantial loans made to the Aluminum Co. of Canada. How are they to be paid off?

Secretary JONES. They are paid off at so much a pound out of the purchase price of the aluminum. . . .

Senator AIKEN. What was the amount that was loaned for the Shipshaw development?

Secretary JONES. I think advances were made in the neighborhood of \$68,000,000 but I do not think that the money was used to develop the power plant. At least, we are advised by them that it was not. They already had that in contemplation and probably under way.

Senator FERGUSON. Did they get money which they did not use in the development?

Secretary JONES. Not for the power but in building the plants to manufacture the metal.

Senator FERGUSON. They did use it then in the building of the plants?

Secretary JONES. Yes, that is what it was for; otherwise they could not give us the metal. . . .

Senator FERGUSON. The reason I asked, I wondered if this plant in Canada, the Shipshaw, would be able, after the war, to produce aluminum so cheaply that the plants constructed in this country would be unable to compete with it without protection?

Secretary JONES. I do not think it would need any protection, as against our plants in the Tennessee Valley, some on the Canadian border, and the West because we have just as cheap power as anyone else.

Senator FERGUSON. Are those Government plants or privately owned plants that you are speaking of now, that have the cheap power?

Secretary JONES. Both. For instance, in the Tennessee Valley, Reynolds has the principal property.

In Arkansas we have a big plant and about half of that plant—it is a very big one—can be run with cheap power. The other half is high power. We are buying that from the power companies.

In the West, all of those plants are operated with cheap power.

The CHAIRMAN (Senator HILL). They get Bonneville power?

Secretary JONES. They get the Bonneville power.

Then there is some cheap power, as I say, on the Canadian border, so we will have cheap power enough to much more than supply the demands in this country.

Senator FERGUSON. Does this cheap power from Bonneville Dam apply to private industry?

Secretary JONES. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Is it in the nature of a subsidy?

Secretary JONES. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you selling it, when you say "cheap," under cost of production?

Secretary JONES. Oh, no; it is not sold under cost of production.

The CHAIRMAN. They are paying just what other users would be paying who were using that particular type of manufacture?

Secretary JONES. Alcoa has some cheap power on this side in northern New York State that is as cheap, or a little cheaper probably, than Bonneville, at least just as cheap.

Senator AIKEN. Would not the St. Lawrence power be the cheapest of all if it had been developed?

Secretary JONES. Yes; I think it would.

Mr. President, in spite of the feeling that we had plenty of power, as I have said, the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., on the banks of the St. Lawrence River, right on the site of the proposed development, was closed not long ago. As I understand, 3,500 persons have been thrown out of employment there, and some of them will find it difficult to go anywhere else to obtain employment.

Mr. President, I have presented some of the testimony from high officials of the United States, when they pleaded with Congress in 1941 to construct the St. Lawrence seaway because it looked as if we were going to get into war and would need that development to help us win the war.

The opponents killed the seaway at that time. They killed it largely through delaying tactics. They demanded hearings and hearings and hearings, and they used those hearings to put into circulation half-truths and untruths, to put confusion in the minds of the people.

Anything for delay was the objective then, for they knew that when the war clouds broke, the project would have to be postponed.

Their delaying tactics were successful. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee reported the bill on November 21, 1941, and on December 7, 1941, came Pearl Harbor, and the benefits of the St. Lawrence development again were lost to our country for the duration of this war.

In the hearings at that time, they dragged out the same red herring of treaty versus agreement. Those tactics—the treaty versus Executive agreement technicality—were unsuccessful because the House Rivers and Harbors Committee knew that the special privilege interests of this country were raising the issue solely to defeat the St. Lawrence, and not from any high-minded concern for constitutional principles. The House committee turned them down by a vote of 17 to 8. Even Representative CARTER, from California, the leading opponent, I may say, of the St. Lawrence seaway on that committee, readily admitted that a treaty was not necessarily required.

I am proud of the work of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941. My feeling of pride for the committee is as keen as is my sense of shame that here in America we had men whose greed outweighed in the balance the needs of their country.

They knew, as everyone familiar with the situation knew, that we as a nation were going to be short of electric energy; that we were going to be short of ships; that we were desperately short of inland transportation and yet they said there would be power enough for all our needs.

They fought against the building of more ships in the Great Lakes and the means by which those ships could be gotten to the sea.

We have been told on this floor time and time again that aluminum is the basic metal of the airplane industry, and that without airplanes a nation cannot wage war.

It takes 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce each pound of aluminum.

The St. Lawrence power development would have generated 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity, half in Canada and half in the United States.

Because this power was not ready we were forced to buy power from Canada on a day-to-day basis, to generate steam power in the face of a coal shortage, and transmit that power hundreds of miles to Massena, N. Y., within sight of the St. Lawrence River where over 2,000,000 horsepower rushes by unharnessed. This power transmitted from a distance was desperately needed for other purposes and cost over three times as much as Bonneville power or as St. Lawrence power would have cost had it been available.

The power transmitted to Massena costs between 6 and 7 mills per kilowatt as compared with between 3 and 4 mills in the Tennessee Valley, and 2.2 mills on the Pacific coast.

All along the Great Lakes were shipyards which could have been expanded to increase our merchant marine. Ships have been built on the Great Lakes—small warships—and many more could have been quickly and readily built had there been easy access to the sea.

As it is, those that have been constructed on the Great Lakes have been taken to Chicago, dismantled, floated down the 9-foot canal to the lower Mississippi River and put together again there.

I was in Chicago in October and I saw two of those ships. I do not know the proper nautical term, but we would say they were "knocked down." Everything above the deck was being taken off. Floats were put under the ships and they were floated down the canal into the Mississippi River, down to New Orleans, and there put together. The ships had to be sent by that route because the locks at the International Rapids are only 260 feet in length. I understand that it costs approximately \$250,000 a ship to take them apart, put them together again, in addition to the expense of extra manpower necessary to do the work. I have no figures to prove that statement, but the amount seems reasonable.

Mr. President, had the St. Lawrence seaway been constructed, millions of tons of beef, of grain, of industrial machines, and other essential material for prosecuting this war could have been shipped

directly from Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Toledo, Cleveland, or Buffalo to the war areas where our men have heroically waited for it. But this could not be done. Instead, this material has had to be unloaded at terminal ports at the Great Lakes, transported overland by overburdened railroads, reloaded at Atlantic coast ports, incurring the terrible consequence of delay as well as increased cost of shipping.

I cannot understand how men responsible for blocking the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway in 1941—men who themselves may have sons fighting on the Rhine or dying in the jungles of the South Pacific—can ever sleep at night.

We know now that the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway was a vital war necessity. We know just as well that it is equally vital to our post-war peacetime economy.

The Committee on Commerce, which now questions its own jurisdiction over S. 1385, apparently has not always done so, for it has successively requested some of our most important Government agencies to submit their written opinions on the bill.

It appears to me that had there been any question in the minds of the committee over its jurisdiction, it would have been raised over a year ago. In requesting these reports from Government departments, the committee accepted its jurisdiction over the bill and initiated a study of the bill on the merits of the St. Lawrence project itself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Vermont certainly must know that the reports requested of various agencies are merely a part of the routine. The matter is generally taken care of by the clerk of the committee upon a reference to the committee of a bill.

As a member of the Committee on Commerce, I can testify that the matter was never submitted in any degree whatever, and whatever records were requested were requested by the clerk in the ordinary course, which certainly would not amount to accepting jurisdiction by the committee.

I have been a regular attendant of the meetings of the Committee on Commerce, one of the great committees of the Senate, for which I have a great deal of respect, and membership on which I am proud to have. I have been a member of the committee for approximately 12 years, and I can assure the Senator that no action of any kind was ever taken looking to the acceptance of jurisdiction by that committee over this particular project. At all times it has been the opinion—I will not say of most members—of a number of the members of the committee, that it was a matter not within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee and would not be within its jurisdiction until there had been a treaty which had been considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, as was previously done.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Missouri maintain that this question

could not have been raised a year ago just as well as on November 21, 1944?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I maintain that the matter has never been before the Commerce Committee. I have always publicly and privately maintained the position that a treaty was involved, as it was when the subject was put before the Senate in 1933, and as it should be at this time, and that the Commerce Committee has no jurisdiction. I intended to raise that point in the form of an objection whenever the matter came before the Committee on Commerce for consideration. The matter has never come before the committee for consideration. That is, it did not come until last week, when a committee was appointed to consider the question of whether the matter involved an Executive agreement or a treaty. But irrespective of what the subcommittee or the full committee might say, I still insist, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a treaty is involved, and that it should be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator perhaps was not on the floor when I began speaking and invited the attention of the Senate to the fact that an amendment providing for work in the development of waterways on international boundaries, or even in Canada, was nothing new to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and that, with few exceptions, every single authorization for the development of our water transportation on the Great Lakes and on the St. Lawrence has been made in a river and harbor bill, even though the money was to be spent in Canada or on the international boundary line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator can show me any constitutional authority for the Congress of the United States appropriating money for the improvement of navigation in any foreign country, I shall be glad to have him show it to me. Many Supreme Court decisions have held that the only justification under the Constitution for flood control, power development, or anything else along that line is on the theory of improving navigation on the navigable streams within the United States. If the Senator can show me any constitutional authority for spending American money for Canadian materials and labor to improve a waterway in Canada, I shall be very glad to have him point it out.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I can show the Senator that it has been done and just how it has been done.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I should make a statement as to the so-called Aiken bill and the St. Lawrence seaway proposition. When the bill was first referred to the Commerce Committee, it occurred to me at once that, since the matter had come before the Senate in 1934 as a treaty, there was some question as to

whether the Commerce Committee should take jurisdiction. I immediately took up the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is now present, and I proposed to come onto the floor of the Senate at that time and ask that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That would have been the course but for two facts, namely, that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations informed me that I might go ahead; and if the Commerce Committee should reach the conclusion that the matter involved was a treaty, I could then take the action I have indicated. About that time there came about quite an agitation to the effect that the treaty-making power was not involved. So I decided that I would wait until I heard from the State Department. We did not hear from the State Department until about the middle of April. That is the whole situation; but, of course, if the Senator wishes to take the view that we have taken jurisdiction—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The committee did not assume jurisdiction.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand; but I am saying that if the Senator from Vermont wishes to take that view I shall not challenge his right to do so, and he can do anything else of that sort he chooses without question from me. I do not want it to appear here, however, that we stepped in and took jurisdiction concerning which we were doubtful. I am saying all this in the presence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am not calling on him to verify the statement, but I know he will do so in case of necessity. So I am not at all disturbed about the Senator claiming that by some sort of estoppel, I think, we have taken jurisdiction. That is his view.

If the Senate of the United States should take the view that the Commerce Committee has jurisdiction, then the Commerce Committee will go right ahead. At the present time, I will say that we have been having hearings—the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Overton] is chairman of the subcommittee—on the sole question whether the St. Lawrence seaway proposition as referred to in the bill of the Senator from Vermont is a treaty. We have heard the adviser of the State Department, the counsel of the State Department, Mr. Hackworth; we have heard Dr. Borchard, of Yale; and we have received briefs from others.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator in whose behalf Dr. Borchard appeared before the committee?

Mr. BAILEY. I am sorry to confess my ignorance. He appeared by invitation, but if he represented anybody I do not know it, and, on the other hand, if he did represent someone I think it would appear in the record. My recollection is that the chairman of the subcommittee invited the State Department to send a representative before the committee. I do not know how Dr. Borchard was sent there; I do not know who

sent him; all I know is I heard him with a great deal of delight.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me—

Mr. AIKEN. I do not yield for long speeches but for reasonable explanations, and I do not yield for dual speeches.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the name of Dr. Borchard has been mentioned, I should like to say, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me, that I have been a Member of several different committees before which Dr. Borchard has appeared, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Commerce, and in every case so far as I know—and I think I am fully advised about the matter—Dr. Borchard appeared at his own expense, as a public-spirited citizen, and not representing anybody except his own view. I have not always agreed with Dr. Borchard's views, but I do not think that anyone until this moment ever questioned the public spiritedness and high intelligence of Dr. Borchard.

Mr. AIKEN. I still have not heard for whom Dr. Borchard appeared. Does the committee say he appeared in his own behalf as a public-spirited citizen?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not happen to be at the particular hearing the other day, but in my observation—and I have seen him a number of times—Dr. Borchard has always appeared in his own behalf at his own expense as a public-spirited citizen. As I have said, I have not always agreed with Dr. Borchard in his public views but I think it is only fair that I should make the statement I have made.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to conclude my statement. I certainly do not wish to prolong the discussion; the fact is I should like to see it come to an end and have an end of the bill now pending.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to see it come to a happy end, too.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is pleading in a very unhappy way to bring about a happy ending, I think.

I should merely like to say about the appearance of Dr. Borchard that if I should hear tomorrow that he was paid \$10,000 by someone to appear, it would not affect my mind in the slightest degree. It did not occur to me to ask if he had been paid—I would be glad if somebody paid him; we had no money to pay him—but I am capable I hope, and I trust I shall always be capable, just as any judge should be, of hearing a man on the merits regardless of the source of his compensation.

Dr. Borchard's brief is here, and I invite the Senator to study it, and I would ask him not to discount the intellectual honesty or integrity of a professor in Yale University on the ground that he represented somebody or that he received a fee. I am not saying that he did. My impression is he received nothing. But the purport and intent of my statement is that it would not have made the slightest difference to me if he had begun his speech by saying that he had received a fee for it. I would have read the speech

and would have read the brief. I am capable of finding the truth, I hope, no matter from what source it may come.

I hope I have cleared that with the Senator as to myself and my relations with this matter. We will take jurisdiction if the Senate thinks we should; but we are going to submit a report, and I think it would be a good thing—I will take the liberty of making the suggestion to the Senator from Vermont—it would be a good thing if he could wait until the report is submitted with the record, and let us go about this matter in an orderly fashion, and ascertain, to begin with, whether it involves a treaty or not. I assure the Senator that he is never going to be able to get anywhere until that question is settled. Why not settle that first?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry that, because of the multiplicity of conversations on the floor, I was unable to hear everything the Senator from North Carolina said. However, the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Missouri raised a question which caused me to digress very briefly from the discussion of the St. Lawrence seaway.

First, in regard to Mr. Borchard, of Yale, who appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce at the hearings on Treaty versus Agreement, I think we are entirely within our rights in assuming that Mr. Borchard appeared in behalf of the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway; first, because on November 6, 1944, the chairman of the subcommittee advised the members of the subcommittee, as well as Secretary Hull, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and others, that the opponents would be asked to present their side of the case, which was entirely proper.

Secondly, I hold in my hand a brief which had been prepared by Mr. Borchard for some organization. No name is on it, but I understand it has been incorporated under the name of National St. Lawrence Project Conference.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Dr. Borchard is a resident of my State, and I happen to enjoy his friendship. I should like to know whether the Senator thinks there was anything wrong.

Mr. AIKEN. No; and I do not see why anyone should not say right out that he appeared in behalf of utility companies, because I understand they pay the expenses of this organization.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator says he thinks he is safe in assuming Dr. Borchard appeared in behalf of somebody. I do not see on what he bases that assumption. In a little less than a month I shall be out of the Senate, but at a hearing on the St. Lawrence waterway project I intend to appear before the appropriate Senate committee in my own behalf, at my own expense, not representing any utility or any other company, and the Senator will have just as much right to say about me that because I

happen to oppose his particular view I am appearing in behalf of somebody else as he has to say it about Dr. Borchard. He has not a scintilla of evidence that Dr. Borchard is representing anybody except himself. I can assure the Senator that when this matter comes up in the next Congress—and it will be in the next Congress, without any "ifs" and "ands"—I repeat, I shall appear here before the appropriate senatorial committee in my own behalf, as a citizen of the United States, at my own expense, not representing anybody, and the Senator would have just as much right to say about me as he has about Dr. Borchard now that I was representing some special interest and being paid.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think this should be made an issue.

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely not.

Mr. MALONEY. If Dr. Borchard were chosen by some opponents of the proposal, it would be merely a tribute to their good judgment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Connecticut is absolutely correct. This is not made an issue. I have Dr. Borchard's brief in my hand, and a statement signed by the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, that they had looked around and decided to get the best man to prepare this statement for them, and engaged him to do it. So I do not see why there should be any criticism at all of Dr. Borchard appearing in behalf of this group, composed mostly of public-utility people, and one business or another.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not mean to say that there would be any reflection on Dr. Borchard if he did appear representing a group. I know Dr. Borchard well enough to know that if he were employed in the matter, representing a group of any sort, he would frankly state that in the very opening statement of his testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, some time ago the question was raised, I think by the Senator from Missouri, although I am not sure as to that, inviting me to point out any instance in which authorization of work begun in a foreign country had been made in a rivers and harbors bill by the Rivers and Harbors Committee. In response to that invitation, if it may be called an invitation, I wish to submit a report which I have received from the Army engineers naming projects which they have worked on in Canada. I asked them to give the name of the development, the cost of the development, and the authorization under which the work was done. I have here the list, which goes back to June 13, 1902, when there was an authorization involving work on Hay Lake and Neebish Channels, in that section of the river below the locks.

On September 22, 1922, authorization was given for widening the upper approach to the canals through Vidal Shoals.

January 21, 1927, there was authorization for the removal of Round Island, middle ground, extension of northwest canal pier, and widening channels Mid-

dle Neebish route. This is all on the St. Marys River, Mich.

On July 3, 1930, an authorization was given for deepening channels throughout the down-bound route.

August 30, 1935, authorization was given for widening Brush Point turn and the channel from Brush Point to Point Louise.

The cost of this work—all United States work done in Canada—was \$1,280,000, the work being on the St. Marys River.

Every one of those projects was authorized after an exchange of notes with Canada, and then it was approved in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if it is agreeable for the Senator from Vermont to yield the floor at this time, so the Senate may go into executive session and consider executive business?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator anticipate that consideration of executive business will take the remainder of the day?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say. It may take the remainder of the day. Of course, when the Senate goes back into legislative session—

Mr. AIKEN. Because of the discussion which has taken place it has taken me about twice as long as I expected to occupy in speaking in behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway. But, with the understanding that I may have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, I gladly yield at this time.

Mr. HILL. I am quite confident that when the Senate resumes consideration of the pending business the Senator from Vermont may obtain the floor to continue his remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to take about 2 minutes to insert the remainder of the list I have before me at this time.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. We come to the St. Clair River in Michigan. On July 13, 1892, a 20-foot channel in the river was authorized. On July 3, 1930, authorization was granted for deepening of the channel to 25 and 26 feet, and compensating works. The part of the work which was done in Canada cost \$560,000. The authorizations were placed in river and harbor acts after an exchange of notes. The list contains the dates when exchange of notes were had, and the documents referring to them.

We come next to the Detroit River, Mich. Work was authorized in river and harbor acts passed June 13, 1902, March 3, 1905, and June 25, 1910, on the Amherstburg Channel and removal of Grose Isle Shoal.

Authorization was contained in the river and harbor act of March 4, 1913, for work in Fighting Island Channel. All the works to which I now refer are in the Detroit River. Other authorizations for work in the Detroit River are contained in the list. The United States spent \$19,290,000 on projects in the Detroit River in Canada, and every dollar of it was spent under authorization contained in river and harbor acts, after

exchange of notes between the United States and Canada.

We come then to Niagara River weir above Goat Island. The United States-St. Lawrence Advisory Committee and the Canadian Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committee recommended the nature and design of the remedial works and cost allocation, and each country spent \$342,000. There was no authorization whatsoever for that. The money was evidently obtained and both countries proceeded and spent it.

That, Mr. President, completes the list. It shows that all these projects and developments in Canadian waters have been authorized in simple river and harbor acts, just as we are asking that the present project be authorized.

Mr. President, I now ask that the table I have just been discussing be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. MARYS RIVER, MICH.

River and Harbor acts	Work authorized (existing project involving work in Canada)	Documents	Cost of all United States work in Canada	Date of latest exchanges of notes with Canada
June 13, 1902	Hay Lake and Neebish Channels, work in that section of the river below the locks.	H. Doc. 128, 56th Cong., 2d sess.	\$1,280,000	July-August 1936; October 1930-February 1931; February-October 1928.
Sept. 22, 1922	Widening upper approach to the canals through Vidal Shoals.	District Engineer Report, Oct. 29, 1920.	-----	-----
Jan. 21, 1927	Removal of Bound Island middle ground, extension of northwest canal pier, and widening channels middle Neebish route.	H. Doc. 270, 69th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----
July 3, 1930	Deepening channels throughout the down-bound route.	H. Doc. 253, 70th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----
Aug. 30, 1935	Widening Brush Point turn and the channel from Brush Point to Point Louise.	Rivers and Harbors Committee Doc. 53, 74th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----

NOTE.—Prior project authorized by acts dating back to July 8, 1856.

ST. CLAIR RIVER, MICH.

July 13, 1892	20-foot channel in the river.	H. Doc. 207, 51st Cong., 2d sess.	\$560,000	March-October 1934; April-August 1941.
July 3, 1930	Deepening of channel to 25 and 26 feet, and compensating works.	H. Doc. 253, 70th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----

DETROIT RIVER, MICH.

June 13, 1902	Amherstburg Channel and removal of Grose Isle Shoal.	H. Doc. 712, 56th Cong., 1st sess., and H. Doc. 40, 58th Cong., 3d sess.	\$19,290,000	September 1933 - October 1934; March 1932.
Mar. 3, 1905	Fighting Island Channel.	H. Doc. 17, 62d Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----
June 25, 1910	Livingstone Channel.	H. Doc. 266, 59th Cong., 2d sess.; H. Doc. 676, 61st Cong., 2d sess., and H. Doc. 322, 65th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----
Mar. 2, 1907				
June 25, 1910				
Mar. 2, 1919				
July 3, 1930	Channel depths of 25 and 26 feet.	H. Doc. 253, 70th Cong., 1st sess.	-----	-----

NOTE.—Prior project authorized by acts dating back to June 23, 1874.

NIAGARA RIVER WEIR ABOVE GOAT ISLAND

None	The United States St. Lawrence Advisory Committee and the Canadian Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committee recommended the nature and design of the remedial works and cost allocation.	-----	\$342,000	Oct. 27, 1941.
------	--	-------	-----------	----------------

¹ To June 1944, Canada having spent a like amount.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BETWEEN OGDENSBURG, N. Y., AND LAKE ONTARIO

All United States work confined to that in United States waters.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now gladly yield the floor with the understanding that I may resume tomorrow where I left off today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations—

and withdrawing a nomination—which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois, now United States representative on the Advisory Council for Italy, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers of the Army of the United States for appointment in the Regular Army.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hall	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bibbo	Hayden	Robertson
Buck	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	La Follette	Tunnell
Chandler	Langer	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Vandenberg
Connally	McClellan	Wagner
Cordon	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Downey	Maybank	Wheeler
Eastland	Mead	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson
Green	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

If there be no further reports of committees, the Senate will proceed to consider certain treaties which the Chair is informed are the first business on the calendar.

DOUBLE TAXATION CONVENTION WITH CANADA

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive G (Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), a convention between the United States of America and Canada for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, signed in Ottawa on June 8, 1944, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, being desirous of avoiding double taxation and of preventing fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, have decided to conclude a Convention and for that

purpose have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

Ray Atherton, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America at Ottawa, for the United States of America; and

W. L. Mackenzie King, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Colin W. G. Gibson, Minister of National Revenue, for Canada.

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

1. The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) for the United States of America; the Federal estate taxes;

(b) for Canada; the taxes imposed under the Dominion Succession Duty Act.

2. In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either contracting State, the competent authorities of the contracting States, will consult together.

ARTICLE II

1. Real property situated in Canada shall be exempt from the application of the taxes imposed by the United States of America.

2. Real property situated in the United States of America shall be exempt from the application of the taxes imposed by Canada.

3. The question whether rights relating to or secured by real property are to be considered as real property for the purposes of this Convention shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

ARTICLE III

1. Shares in a corporation organized in or under the laws of the United States of America, of any of the states or territories of the United States of America, or of the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be property situated within the United States of America.

2. Shares in a corporation organized in or under the laws of Canada, or of any of the provinces or territories of Canada, shall be deemed to be property situated within Canada.

3. This Article shall not be construed as limiting the liability of the estate of any person not domiciled in Canada or of any citizen of the United States of America, under the estate tax laws of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV

1. The situs of property shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax, except as otherwise provided in this Convention.

2. Allowance for debts shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

3. Domicile shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax.

ARTICLE V

1. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of, or domiciled in, the United States of America, the United States of America may include in the gross estate any property (other than real property) situated in Canada as though this Convention had not come into effect.

2. In the case of a decedent (other than a citizen of the United States of America) who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, the United States of America shall, in imposing the taxes to which this Convention relates:

(a) take into account only property situated in the United States of America; and

(b) allow as an exemption an amount which bears the same ratio to the personal exemption allowed in the case of a decedent

who was at the time of his death a citizen of, or domiciled in, the United States of America as the value of the property of such decedent situated in the United States of America bears to the value of the property included in the entire gross estate of the decedent.

3. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, Canada may include in the gross estate any property (other than real property) situated in the United States of America as though this Convention had not come into effect.

4. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in the United States of America, Canada shall, in imposing the taxes to which this Convention relates:

(a) take into account only property situated in Canada; and

(b) allow as an exemption an amount which bears the same ratio to the personal exemption allowed in the case of a decedent who was at the time of his death domiciled in Canada as the value of the property of such decedent situated in Canada bears to the entire value of the property, wherever situated.

ARTICLE VI

1. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States of America, the United States of America shall impose the estate taxes to which this Convention relates upon the following conditions:

(a) In respect of property situated in Canada which, for the purpose of estate taxes, is included in the gross estate, less such property as is specifically deducted therefrom (either because of transfer for public, charitable, educational, religious or similar uses or because the property has been previously taxed under provisions of law relating to property previously taxed), there shall be allowed against the estate taxes a credit for Canadian succession taxes in respect of the property situated in Canada, the situs of such property being determined in accordance with the laws of Canada, subject to the provisions of this Convention.

(b) The portion of the Canadian succession taxes to be allowed as a credit against United States estate taxes shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total Canadian succession taxes as the value of the property situated in Canada and with respect to which estate taxes are imposed by the United States of America bears to the total value of the property with respect to which succession taxes are imposed by Canada.

(c) The credit in any such case shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to such estate taxes, computed without the credit provided for herein, as the value of the property situated in Canada and not excluded or deducted from the gross estate as provided in (a) bears to the value of the entire gross estate.

(d) The values referred to in (c) are the values determined by the United States of America for the purpose of estate taxes.

(e) The credit provided for herein shall apply after the application of section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942.

2. In the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was domiciled in Canada, Canada shall impose the succession taxes to which this Convention relates upon the following conditions:

(a) In respect of property situated in the United States of America which, for the purpose of succession taxes, is included in the gross estate, less such property as is specifically deducted therefrom (because of transfer for charitable, educational, religious or similar uses), there shall be allowed against the

succession taxes a credit for United States estate taxes in respect of the property situated in the United States of America, the situs of such property being determined in accordance with the laws of the United States of America, subject to the provisions of this Convention.

(b) The portion of the United States estate taxes to be allowed as a credit against Canadian succession taxes shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total United States estate taxes as the value of the property situated in the United States of America and with respect to which succession taxes are imposed by Canada bears to the total value of the property with respect to which estate taxes are imposed by the United States of America.

(c) The credit in any such case shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to such succession taxes, computed without the credit provided for herein, as the value of the property situated in the United States of America and not excluded or deducted from the gross estate as provided in (a) bears to the entire value of the property, wherever situated.

(d) The values referred to in (c) are the values determined by Canada for the purpose of succession taxes.

3. (a) The credit referred to in this Article may be allowed by the United States of America if claim therefor is filed within the periods provided in section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

(b) The credit referred to in this Article may be allowed by Canada if claim therefor is filed within the period provided by subsection 4 of section 35 of the Dominion Succession Duty Act relating to refund of overpayment.

(c) A refund based on the credit may be made if a claim therefor is filed within the respective periods above provided.

(d) Any refund based on the provisions of this Article or any other provisions of this Convention shall be made without interest.

ARTICLE VII

1. With a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion each of the contracting States undertakes to furnish to the other contracting State as provided in the succeeding Articles of this Convention, the information which its competent authorities have at their disposal or are in a position to obtain under its revenue laws in so far as such information may be of use to the authorities of the other contracting State in the assessment of the taxes to which this Convention relates.

2. The information to be furnished under this Article, whether in the ordinary course or on request, may be exchanged directly between the competent authorities of the two contracting States.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Commissioner shall notify the Minister as soon as practicable when the Commissioner ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the Federal estate tax laws, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada;

(b) a decedent domiciled in Canada, any part of whose estate is subject to the Dominion Succession Duty Act, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States of America.

2. The Minister shall notify the Commissioner as soon as practicable when the Minister ascertains that in the case of:

(a) a decedent, any part of whose estate is subject to the Dominion Succession Duty Act, there is property of such decedent situated in the United States of America;

(b) a decedent domiciled in the United States of America, any part of whose estate is subject to the Federal estate tax laws, there is property of such decedent situated in Canada.

ARTICLE IX

1. If the Minister deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the Commissioner in determination of the succession tax liability of any person, the Commissioner may, upon request, furnish the Minister such information bearing upon the matter as the Commissioner is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of the United States of America.

2. If the Commissioner deems it necessary to obtain the cooperation of the Minister in the determination of the estate tax liability of any person, the Minister may, upon request, furnish the Commissioner such information bearing upon the matter as the Minister is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of Canada.

ARTICLE X

The competent authorities of the contracting States may:

(a) prescribe regulations to carry into effect this Convention within the respective States and rules with respect to the exchange of information;

(b) if doubt arises, settle questions of interpretation or application of this Convention by mutual agreement;

(c) communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XI

If any fiduciary or beneficiary can show that double taxation has resulted or may result in respect of the taxes to which this Convention relates, such fiduciary or beneficiary shall be entitled to lodge a claim or protest with the State of citizenship or domicile of such fiduciary or beneficiary, or, if a corporation or other entity, with the State in which created or organized. If the claim or protest should be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of such State may consult with the competent authority of the other State to determine whether the alleged double taxation exists or may occur and if so whether it may be avoided in accordance with the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XII

The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

ARTICLE XIII

1. As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "Minister" means the Minister of National Revenue of Canada or his duly authorized representative.

(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, or his duly authorized representative.

(c) The term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means the Commissioner and the Minister and their duly authorized representatives.

2. When used in a geographical sense:

(a) The term "United States of America" includes only the states, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Canada" means the provinces, the territories and Sable Island.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

2. This Convention shall be deemed to have come into effect on the fourteenth day of June, 1941. It shall continue in effect for a period of five years from that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the con-

tracting States at the end of the five year period or at any time thereafter provided that at least six months prior notice of termination has been given.

Done in duplicate, at Ottawa, this eighth day of June, 1944.

RAY ATHERTON.
W. L. MACKENZIE KING.
COLIN GIBSON.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas make a brief explanation of the convention?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the treaty relates only to estate taxes, and it deals with the subject of American citizens owning properties in Canada and Canadian citizens owning properties in the United States. Its purpose is to avoid double taxation in both jurisdictions. Under Canadian law, the stock of a corporation in Canada is taxed, even though it may be owned in the United States, and regardless of the residence of the owner. For the United States to assess an inheritance tax would amount to a double burden on that kind of an estate. It is to avoid that situation that this convention has been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this convention. The purpose of it is to grant a credit to citizens of the United States as to the stocks of Canadian corporations, and to citizens of Canada as to the stocks of American corporations, to avoid double taxation on such stocks. I do not think there can be any possible objection to the convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein). That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive G, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, signed in Ottawa on June 8, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

DOUBLE TAXATION CONVENTION WITH FRANCE

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention and protocol, Executive I (Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), a convention and protocol between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of

income and other taxes, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF RECIPROCAL ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF INCOME AND OTHER TAXES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the French Republic, being desirous of avoiding double taxation and of establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, have decided to conclude a convention and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. William Christian Bullitt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France;

The President of the French Republic: M. Georges Bonnet, Member of the Chamber of Deputies, Minister for Foreign Affairs, who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

TITLE I. DOUBLE TAXATION

Article 1

The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

- (a) In the case of the United States of America: The federal income taxes, including surtaxes and excess-profits taxes;
- (b) In the case of France:
 - (1) The real estate tax;
 - (2) The industrial and commercial profits tax;
 - (3) The annual tax on undistributed profits;
 - (4) The agricultural profits tax;
 - (5) The tax on salaries, allowances and emoluments, wages, pensions and annuities;
 - (6) The professional profits tax;
 - (7) The tax on income from securities and movable capital;
 - (8) The general income tax.

Article 2

Income from real property, including income from agricultural undertakings, shall be taxable only in the State in which such real property is situated.

Article 3

An enterprise of one of the contracting States is not subject to taxation by the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits except in respect of such profits allocable to its permanent establishment in the latter State.

No account shall be taken, in determining the tax in one of the contracting States, of the purchase of merchandise effected therein by an enterprise of the other State for the purpose of supplying establishments maintained by such enterprise in the latter State.

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial and commercial profits.

The term "industrial and commercial profits" shall not include the following:

- (a) Income from real property;
- (b) Income from mortgages, from public funds, securities (including mortgage bonds), loans, deposits and current accounts;
- (c) Dividends and other income from shares in a corporation;
- (d) Rentals or royalties arising from leasing personal property or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of, or for the privilege of using, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulae, goodwill, trade marks, trade brands, franchises and other like property;
- (e) Profit or loss from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

Subject to the provisions of this Convention the income referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) shall be taxed separately or together with industrial and com-

mercial profits in accordance with the laws of the contracting States.

Article 4

American enterprises having permanent establishments in France are required to submit to the French fiscal administration the same declarations and the same justifications, with respect to such establishments, as French enterprises.

The French fiscal administration has the right, within the provisions of its national legislation and subject to the measures of appeal provided in such legislation, to make such corrections in the declaration of profits realized in France as may be necessary to show the exact amount of such profits.

The same principle applies mutatis mutandis to French enterprises having permanent establishments in the United States.

Article 5

When an American enterprise, by reason of its participation in the management or capital of a French enterprise, makes or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with a third enterprise, any profits which should normally have appeared in the balance sheet of the French enterprise, but which have been in this manner, diverted to the American enterprise, are, subject to the measures of appeal applicable in the case of the tax on industrial and commercial profits, incorporated in the taxable profits of the French enterprise.

The same principle applies mutatis mutandis, in the event that profits are diverted from an American enterprise to a French enterprise.

Article 6

Income derived by navigation enterprises of one of the contracting States from the operation of ships documented under the laws of that State shall continue to benefit in the other State by the reciprocal tax exemptions accorded by the exchange of notes of June 11 and July 8, 1927 between the United States of America and France.

Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other State.

Article 7

Royalties from real property or in respect of the operation of mines, quarries or other natural resources shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries or other natural resources are situated.

Royalties derived from within one of the contracting States by a resident or by a corporation or other entity of the other contracting State as consideration for the right to use copyrights, patents, secret processes and formulae, trademarks and other analogous rights shall be exempt from taxation in the former State, provided such resident, corporation or other entity does not have a permanent establishment there.

Article 8

Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions paid by one of the contracting States or by a political subdivision thereof to individuals residing in the other State shall be exempt from taxation in the latter State.

Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

Article 9

Income from labor or personal services shall be taxable only in the State in which the taxpayer carries on his personal activity.

This provision does not apply to the income referred to in Article 8.

Article 10

Income from the exercise of a liberal profession shall be taxable only in the State in which the professional activity is exercised.

There is the exercise of a liberal profession in one of the two contracting States only when the professional activity has a fixed center in that country.

Article 11

Gains derived in one of the contracting States from the sale or exchange of stocks, securities or commodities by a resident or a corporation or other entity of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State, provided such resident or corporation or other entity has no permanent establishment in the former State.

Article 12

Students from one of the contracting States residing in the other contracting State exclusively for the purpose of study shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received from within the former State for the purpose of their maintenance or studies.

Article 13

In the calculation of taxes established in one of the contracting States on the use of property or increment of property of an enterprise of the other State, account shall be taken only of that portion of the capital situated or employed and allocable to a permanent establishment within the former State.

The foregoing provision shall apply to the French "patent" tax and the United States capital stock tax even though these two taxes have not been referred to in Article 1 of the present Convention.

In the application of the present Article navigation enterprises of one of the contracting States, enjoying in the other State the benefits of Article 6 of the present Convention, shall not be considered as having a permanent establishment in the latter State insofar as shipping activities are concerned.

Article 14

It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

A. As regards the United States of America: Notwithstanding any other provision of this Convention, the United States of America in determining the income and excess-profits taxes, including all surtaxes, of its citizens, or residents, or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed, all items of income taxable under the Revenue Laws of the United States of America, as though this Convention had not come into effect. The United States of America shall, however, deduct from the taxes thus computed the amount of French income tax paid. This deduction shall be made in accordance with the benefits and limitations of Section 131 of the United States Internal Revenue Code relating to credit for foreign taxes.

B. As regards France:

(a) **Schedular taxes:** Income from securities, debts and trusts having its source in the United States of America shall be subject in France to the tax on income from securities; but this tax shall be reduced by the amount of the tax already paid in the United States of America on the same income. In consideration of the fiscal regime to which the legislation of the United States of America subjects the income of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations or other entities, the deduction of the tax paid in the United States of America shall be effected in a lump sum through a reduction of 12 in the rate of the tax established by the French law.

The income other than that indicated in the preceding paragraph shall not be subject to any schedular tax in France when, accord-

ing to this Convention, it is taxable in the United States of America.

(b) General tax on revenue: Notwithstanding any other provision of the present Convention, the general income tax can be determined according to all the elements of taxable income as imposed by French fiscal legislation.

However, the provisions of the first paragraph of Article 114 of the French Code on direct taxation relative to the taxation of aliens domiciled or resident in France shall continue to be applied.

Article 15

In derogation of Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, American corporations which maintain in France permanent establishments shall be liable to the tax on income from securities on three-fourths of the profits actually derived from such establishments, the industrial and commercial profits being determined in accordance with Articles 3 and 4 of this Convention.

The remaining one-fourth shall, in all cases, be taken as the basis of the annual tax on undistributed profits applicable to the same corporations.

Article 16

An American corporation shall not be subject to the obligations prescribed by Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, by reason of any participation in the management or in the capital of, or any other relations with, a French corporation. In such case, the tax on income from securities continues to be levied, in conformity with French legislation, on the dividends, interest and all other distributions made by the French enterprise; but it is moreover collectible, if the occasion arises, and subject to the measures of appeal applicable in the case of the tax on income from securities, with respect to the profits which the American corporation derives from the French corporation under the conditions prescribed in Article 5.

Article 17

The American corporations subject to the provisions of Article 3 of the Decree of December 6, 1872, who were not placed under the special regime established by Articles 5 and 6 of the Convention for the avoidance of double income taxation between the United States of America and France, signed April 27, 1932, may, during a new period of six months from the date of the entry into force of the present Convention, exercise with reference to past years, the option provided in those two articles under the conditions which they prescribe.

Moreover, the American corporations contemplated in the third paragraph of Article 10 of the Convention of April 27, 1932, may be admitted to benefit from the provisions of that paragraph, when the tax has not yet been paid, if the latter was not found to be payable, prior to May 1, 1930, by a definitive judicial decision or if such decision has been the subject of an appeal in cassation.

Article 18

Any United States income tax liability remaining unpaid as at the effective date of this Convention for years beginning prior to January 1, 1936 of any individual resident of France (other than a citizen of the United States of America) or of a French corporation may be adjusted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, on the basis of the provisions of the United States Revenue Act of 1936. However, no adjustment will be made more than two years subsequent to the effective date of this Convention unless the taxpayer files a request with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue prior to such date.

Article 19

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Convention, in order to avoid double tax-

ation on public servants, employees of one of the contracting States being citizens of that State and remunerated by it, who have been received by the other State to perform services in such State shall be exempt in their principal places of residence from direct and personal taxes whether national, state or local.

Such employees who own real property in the State in which they perform services shall not benefit from the above exemptions with respect to the taxes levied on such real property. Employees who engage in any private gainful occupation in such State shall not be entitled to any exemption under this Article.

TITLE II. FISCAL ASSISTANCE

Article 20

With a view to the more effective imposition of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, the contracting States undertake, on condition of reciprocity, to furnish information of a fiscal nature which the authorities of each State concerned have at their disposal, or are in a position to obtain under their own laws, that may be of use to the authorities of the other State in the assessment of the said taxes.

Such information shall be exchanged between the competent authorities of the contracting States in the ordinary course or on request.

Article 21

In accordance with the preceding Article, the competent authorities of the United States of America will transmit to the competent authorities of France, as regards any person, corporation or other entity (other than a citizen, corporation or other entity of the United States of America) having an address in France and deriving from sources within the United States of America rents, dividends, interest, royalties, income from trusts, wages, salaries, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable periodical income, the name and address of such person, corporation or other entity as well as the amount of such income.

The competent authorities of France will transmit to the competent authorities of the United States of America, as regards any person, corporation or other entity (other than a citizen, corporation or other entity of France) having an address in the United States of America and deriving from sources within France rents, dividends, interest, royalties, income from trusts, wages, salaries, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable periodical income, the name and address of such person, corporation or other entity as well as the amount of such income.

The information relating to each year will be transmitted as soon as possible after December 31.

Article 22

The competent authorities of each of the contracting States shall be entitled to obtain, through diplomatic channels, from the competent authorities of the other contracting States, except with respect to citizens, corporations or other entities of the State to which application is made, particulars in concrete cases necessary for the establishment of the taxes to which the present Convention relates.

However, the competent authorities of each State shall not be prevented from transmitting to the competent authorities of the other State information relating to their own nationals (citizens, corporations or other entities) if they deem it opportune for the prevention of fiscal evasion.

Article 23

Each contracting State undertakes to lend assistance and support in the collection of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, together with interest, costs, and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character according to the laws of

the State requested, in the cases where the taxes are definitively due according to the laws of the State making the application.

In the case of an application for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the contracting States which have been finally determined shall be accepted for enforcement by the State to which application is made and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

The application shall be accompanied by such documents as are required by the laws of the State making the application, to establish that the taxes have been finally determined.

If the revenue claim has not been finally determined, the State to which application is made may, at the request of the State making the application, take such measures of conservancy as are authorized by the laws of the former State for the enforcement of its own taxes.

The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations or other entities of the State to which application is made.

Article 24

In no case shall the provisions of Article 22 relating to particulars in concrete cases, or of Article 23 relating to mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, be construed so as to impose upon either of the contracting States the obligation to carry out administrative measures at variance with the regulations and practice of either contracting State, or to supply particulars which are not procurable under the law of the State to which application is made, or that of the State making application.

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it. Nevertheless, such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a business, industrial, or trade secret. In such case it shall inform, as soon as possible, the State making the application.

Article 25

Any taxpayer who shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such States may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

Article 26

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, rates of conversion of currencies, transfer of sums collected, minimum amounts subject to collection, payment of costs of collection, and related matters.

TITLE III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 27

The present Convention shall be ratified, in the case of the United States of America by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and in the case of France, by the President of the French Republic with the consent of the Parliament.

This Convention shall become effective on the first day of January following the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

The Convention shall remain in force for a period of five years and indefinitely thereafter but may be terminated by either contracting State at the end of the five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

Upon the coming into effect of this Convention, the Convention for the avoidance of double income taxation between the United States of America and France, signed April 27, 1932 shall terminate.

Done at Paris, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this 25th day of July, 1939.

[SEAL]
[SEAL]

WILLIAM C. BULLITT
GEORGES BONNET

PROTOCOL

At the moment of signing the present Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have agreed that the following provisions shall form an integral part of the Convention:

I

The present Convention is concluded with reference to American and French law in force on the day of its signature.

Accordingly, if these laws are appreciably modified the competent authorities of the two States will consult together.

II

The income from real property referred to in Article 2 of the present Convention shall include profits from the sale or exchange of the said property, but shall not include interest on mortgages or obligations secured by the said property.

III

As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "permanent establishment" includes branches, mines and oil wells, plantations, factories, workshops, stores, purchasing and selling and other offices, agencies, warehouses, and other fixed places of business but does not include a subsidiary corporation.

When an enterprise of one of the contracting States carries on business in the other State through an employee or agent, established there, who has general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders which he receives, this enterprise shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the latter State. But the fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States has business dealings in the other State through a bona fide commission agent or broker shall not be held to mean that such enterprise has a permanent establishment in the latter State.

Insurance enterprises shall be considered as having a permanent establishment in one of the States as soon as they receive premiums from or insure risks in the territory of that State.

(b) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(c) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, "United States enterprise" or "French enterprise."

(d) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States of America by a resident of the United States of America or by a United States corporation or other entity.

The term "United States corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corpora-

tion or other entity created or organized in the United States of America or under the law of the United States of America or of any State or Territory of the United States of America.

(e) The term "French enterprise" is defined in the same manner, mutatis mutandis, as the term "United States enterprise."

IV

The term "life annuities" referred to in Article 8 of this Convention means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years to the person who has paid the premiums or a gross sum for such an obligation.

V

Citizens and corporations or other entities of one of the contracting States within the other contracting State shall not be subjected as regards the taxes referred to in the present Convention, to the payment of higher taxes than are imposed upon the citizens or corporations or other entities of such latter State.

VI

The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit, allowance, or other advantage accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

VII

Documents and information contained therein, transmitted under the provisions of this Convention by one of the contracting States to the other contracting State shall not be published, revealed or disclosed to any person except to the extent permitted under the laws of the latter State with respect to similar documents or information.

VIII

As used in this Convention the terms "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Treasury and in the case of France, the Minister of Finance.

IX

The term "United States of America" as used in this Convention in a geographic sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

X

The term "France", when used in a geographic sense, indicates continental France, exclusive of Algeria and the Colonies.

XI

Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

Done in duplicate at Paris, this 25th day of July 1939.

WILLIAM C. BULLITT
GEORGES BONNET

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention and protocol are before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention and protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The convention and protocol were reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate ad-

vised and consent to the ratification of Executive I, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the convention and protocol between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on July 25, 1939, for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention and protocol are ratified.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive J (Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), a protocol signed in London, August 31, 1944, prolonging the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, which was read the second time, as follows:

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on the 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on the 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on the 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after the 31st August, 1942;

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present emergency, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after the 31st August, 1944.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV and V of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting point.

2. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1 the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date the 31st August, 1944, and shall remain open for

signature until the 30th September, 1944; provided however that any signatures appended after the 31st August 1944, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

In witness whereof the undersigned being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 31st day of August, 1944, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

DENEYS REITZ.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

S. M. BRUCE.

For the Government of Belgium:

VTE DE LANTSHEERE.

For the Government of Brazil:

MONIZ DE ARAGAO.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

ANTHONY EDEN.

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

G. DE BLANCK.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:

DR. V. JANSÁ.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

R. PÉREZ-ALFONSECA.

For the Government of Haiti:

JOHN G. WINANT.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

E. TEIXEIRA DE MATOS.

For the Government of Peru:

F. BERCKEMEYER.

For the Government of Portugal:

PALMELLA.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

F. GOUSEV.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN G. WINANT.

(Subject to ratification.)

(In respect of the Commonwealth of the Philippines):

JOHN G. WINANT.

For the Government of Poland:

Z. MERDINGER.

Certified a true copy:

[SEAL]

J. F. FRENCH.

Acting Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

LONDON, 7 Oct. 1944.

PROTOCOL TO ENFORCE AND TO PROLONG AFTER AUGUST 31, 1942, THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR, SIGNED IN LONDON ON MAY 6, 1937.

Whereas an Agreement regarding the Regulation of Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereafter referred to as the Agreement) was signed in London on the 6th May, 1937; and

Whereas Article 48 of the Agreement provides as follows:

"(a) The present Agreement shall come into force on the 1st September, 1937, if at that date it has been ratified by all the signatory Governments;

"(b) If by the above-mentioned date the instruments of ratification of all the signatories have not been deposited, the Governments which have ratified the Agreement may decide to put it into force among themselves"; and

Whereas the ratifications of all the signatories were not deposited by the 1st September, 1937; and

Whereas the Agreement has been ratified by the Governments of the following countries:

Union of South Africa,
Commonwealth of Australia,
Brazil,
Belgium,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
Cuba,
Czechoslovakia,
Dominican Republic,
Germany,
Haiti,
Hungary,
India,
Netherlands,
Peru,
Poland,
Portugal,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
United States of America;

and

Whereas it seems desirable that the said Agreement should be put in force between those Governments which have ratified it,

Now, therefore, the undersigned being duly authorised by their respective Governments have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The Agreement shall be regarded as having come into force in respect of the Governments signatories of the present Protocol, on the 1st September, 1937.

ARTICLE 2

After the 31st August, 1942, the Agreement shall continue in force among the said Governments for a period of two years from that date.

ARTICLE 3

The present Protocol shall bear this day's date and shall remain open for signature until the 31st August, 1942. It shall take effect in respect of each signatory Government on the date of signature.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 22nd day of July 1942, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

SIDNEY F. WATSON.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

S. M. BRUCE.

For the Government of Brazil:

J. C. DE ALENAR NETTO.

For the Government of Belgium:

P. KRUNACKER.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

ANTHONY EDEN.

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

G. DE BLANCK.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:

V. JANSÁ.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

R. PÉREZ-ALFONSECA.

For the Government of Haiti:

JOHN G. WINANT.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

E. MICHELS V. VERDUYEN.

For the Government of Peru:

E. LETTS.

For the Government of Portugal:

ARMINDO MONTEIRO.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

J. MAISKY.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN G. WINANT.

(In respect of the Commonwealth of the Philippines):

JOHN G. WINANT.

Certified a true copy:

[SEAL]

STEPHEN GASELEE.

Librarian and Keeper of the Papers at the Foreign Office.

LONDON, 4th Sept. 1942.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Senators are no doubt familiar with the original convention relating to sugar control. It is largely through that authority that we have adopted our own measures of sugar control in this country. The original convention had a vitality of 5 years. Thereafter a protocol was executed extending the period for 2 years. That period of 2 years has expired, and the present protocol is merely an extension for an additional year, from August 31, 1944, to August 31, 1945. The matter was thoroughly considered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and there was no objection whatever to the extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive J, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a protocol, signed in London August 31, 1944, prolonging the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the treaties. The clerk will now proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, which nominations had previously been passed over.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER—ADVERSE REPORT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rachel Elgiva McCracken to be postmaster at Galt, Mo., which had been adversely reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and which had been previously passed over.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my colleague, the Vice President-elect [Mr. TRUMAN] objects to the confirmation of this nomination on personal

grounds, and I ask that it go over until his return.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection to sustaining the action of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the action of the committee is to be sustained, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has reported adversely on the nomination, and has recommended to the Senate that the nomination be not confirmed. That is the action requested by both Senators from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was rejected.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph C. Grew to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to take up the time of the Senate on this nomination. I ask that the nomination be confirmed. There was no objection whatever in the committee, and the nomination was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to read an editorial, before the nomination is voted upon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if I may ask that the Senate proceed to consider nominations on the calendar to which there is no objection, and let the other nominations go over for a few minutes, until we can clean up the unobjectioned to or unquestioned nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar to which there is no objection.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters,

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes consideration of uncontroversial nominations. The clerk will now proceed to state the nominations which have been passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph C. Grew, of New Hampshire, to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I wish to read an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record for today, concerning the nomination for Under Secretary and the nominations for Assistant Secretary of State. The editorial is entitled "Four of a Kind Are Three Too Many." After the headline, the editorial reads as follows:

A good many liberals believe that President Roosevelt's appointments to the State Department add up to a national calamity.

The Record doesn't go that far. We are reasonably sure the Republic will survive the shock. But it may never be quite the same.

The appointments of Messrs. Grew, Clayton, and Rockefeller, plus the choice of Edward J. Stettinius as Secretary, form the most discouraging action taken by the President since 1937. That was the year he took the advice of Winthrop Aldrich, chairman of the Chase National Bank, and other Wall Streeters. Listening to them, the President curtailed Government expenditures for public works and took other deflationary steps in conformance with the rules of orthodox finance. And in 1938 the country went into a tailspin which set back recovery for 3 years.

For reasons that are totally obscure, Mr. Roosevelt has again taken advice from the same questionable sources. This time the results may be far worse than they were after 1937, for these State Department appointments give the big-money boys a try at shaping the economy of the entire post-war world.

The Record was not critical of the appointment of Secretary Stettinius last week. We recognized that in private life he was a representative of the House of Morgan, Wall Street's leading bank. But after trial and error in several Federal posts, he had shown some ability as an organizer. He seemed to have a flair for the public service. And we believed the President would continue to direct our foreign policy, leaving Stettinius to execute it with the help of experienced, progressive assistants.

Now come the "experienced, progressive assistants."

Consider Will L. Clayton. He will have the most important job of all the assistant secretaries. He has been designated to take charge of the problems of post-war finance, reconstruction, relief, and international aviation.

He has no diplomatic experience whatever. In 1940 Jessa Jones induced him to resign as a partner in the world's biggest cotton brokerage business with holdings in Paraguay, Brazil, Argentina, Africa, and Asia, areas over which he will now exert vast political influence. He served in the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and on the Export-Import Bank. He is noted as an ultra-conservative, Texas brand. It is a joke in Washington that his gift of \$6,000 to the duPont-dominated, reactionary, Liberty League during Roosevelt's first term was topped by

contributions of \$7,000 made by his progressive wife to the New Deal.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, grandson of the world's richest man, is probably the hardest worker of all the assistant secretaries. Yet there are a dozen men in Washington better fitted and far more experienced. He has made a good record the last few years as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. He brought music, movies, and entertainment of varied kinds to his job of cultivating South American governments. Good fellow Rockefeller has helped to make good neighbors in Latin America, unless we except Argentina.

He made a good neighbor of Franklin Roosevelt by other methods. He and Mrs. Rockefeller contributed \$5,000 to the campaign fund of Tom Dewey.

The Record does not impugn the honesty of these three men of great wealth—Stettinius, Clayton, Rockefeller. No doubt they enter upon their new duties with patriotic zeal and a sincere desire to set a sick and shattered world upon its feet.

The hardest part of the task in building world peace and setting the stage for prosperity at home will be to resist the self-seeking, private pressure groups. We mean the international bankers with holdings throughout the world; the brokers with clients in every land; the industrialists whose chief aim is foreign trade, the reopening of their factories in Germany, Italy, and Japan. We don't blame these interests for trying to get the best breaks they can from this and other governments.

But it is the bounden duty of Government officials to say "No" to these men when a "Yes" would even remotely jeopardize the national welfare or set up one hazard to world peace.

The Record hopes these three next-of-kin to America's powerful banking and industrial groups can say "No" when the time comes. But it will be almost a miracle if they can resist the pressure of the institutions from which they graduated.

The Record is not prepared to say that no representative of big business or international finance should have an important post in the State Department. It might be good statesmanship to have all the elements of our national life—banking, labor, industry, the professions—merged into this important branch of government. From the conflicting views of such a cross section there might emerge sound compromises in the public interest.

That is the reason the Record accepted with good grace the appointment of Stettinius, although it was not to our liking. Nomination of any one of the five might be accepted as were the nominations of Knox and Stimson, on the theory that it is the duty of the President in wartime to unite the Nation by giving representation to every element and interest.

But what applies to each one separately does not apply to the five taken as a whole. In fact we cannot take them as a whole without uttering a protest that this series of appointments is neither in the character nor in the spirit of the New Deal. It is an affront to the majority of citizens who voted for Mr. Roosevelt.

To allow the State Department to be dominated by a single ultraconservative element, in this most critical period, is an inexcusably dangerous experiment.

Joseph Grew, the new Under Secretary, is not a Wall Streeter except by family connection. He is a career diplomat who served this country well in the Tokyo Embassy in the years immediately preceding the war. He was sharply criticized as Under Secretary in the Cabinet of Calvin Coolidge. Since Pearl Harbor and his return to the United States, Grew has frequently advocated a policy of doing business with Emperor Hirohito after the war. He says we must preserve the Mikado as a Japanese sym-

bol around which a stable, peaceful government can be built.

The man can't have much imagination when in the midst of global war he suggests a future arrangement with Hirohito. It sounds like an echo from another sphere of diplomacy: The Cliveden set believed Britain could do business with Hitler.

Then there is Librarian of Congress Archibald MacLeish. Mr. Roosevelt appointed him as one of the Assistant Secretaries of State. Mr. MacLeish's liberalism is genuine. But he is totally lacking in experience with foreign affairs. His assignment as head of the Translation Division, Public Liaison, Office of Public Information and Cultural Cooperation will give him about as much chance to develop liberal policies as though he were head office boy.

Stick to your poetry and your library, Mr. MacLeish.

We believe that President Roosevelt was elected to a fourth term because the majority of voters believed he would give liberals—not conservatives and reactionaries—a large share of responsibility for building the peace.

One of the reasons for the defeat of Governor Dewey was that the majority of voters believed he would put the administration of our vital foreign and domestic policies in the hands of the Wall Street interests which supported him so generously.

Wall Street must wonder today why it spent so much money for a futile cause—only to get exactly what it wanted for free.

Yet we are not entirely without hope. Mr. Roosevelt has often admitted and corrected his mistakes.

Every staunch supporter of the New Deal will pray that this mistake be recognized in time to avert a repetition of the blunders which followed World War No. 1.

I wish to say frankly that I am in sympathy with the editorial. Since reading the analysis set forth in the editorial I must say that I am not as enthusiastic about the nominations as I may have been previously.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, no one in the whole United States has profited as much personally by the good will of the New Deal administration as has Mr. David Stern, the editor of the Philadelphia Record. The Senator from Pennsylvania has a very high opinion of Mr. Stern. I have had a very pleasant relationship with Mr. Stern. But he has profited more, individually, as a supporter of the New Deal than anyone else in the United States. That is my judgment about it. I assert that it comes with very poor judgment and very poor grace for Mr. Stern to oppose these nominations en bloc.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri explain in what way Mr. Stern has profited unfairly or illegally?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I did not suggest that he had profited illegally. It was all under the law. Unquestionably, Mr. Stern was able to keep his publications floating by the use of the loans which he received under the New Deal. I assert that it comes with very poor grace from him to oppose these nominations en bloc. If he had wanted to oppose some particular nominee on his merits, that would have been a different matter. But I say again that it comes with very poor grace, indeed, for Mr. Dave Stern, who would have been in bankruptcy had it not been for the assistance he received from the New Deal

lending agencies, to attack these nominations en bloc.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, all the loans to which the Senator from Missouri has referred, as well as the interest which fell due from time to time, were paid on time. All requirements under the negotiations were conformed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am not suggesting that the publisher of the Philadelphia Record is not honest. I am suggesting that he would have gone into bankruptcy had it not been for certain policies of the New Deal which enabled him to receive loans under the auspices of Harry Hopkins.

Mr. GUFFEY. How many banks, trust companies, and corporations would not have done the same thing that Mr. Stern did?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think many of them would have done the same thing.

Mr. GUFFEY. Then why pick on Mr. Stern?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I have already said, Mr. President, I believe it comes with very poor grace for Mr. Stern to attack these nominations en bloc. If he wishes to make a particular attack on some one of the nominations, I believe that would be proper. But, as I have said, I think it comes with very poor grace for him to attack all of the nominations en bloc. His attack has not been based on anything in connection with the previous service of any of the nominees, but it has been made because Mr. Stern was trying to be a demagog, which he has always been.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph C. Grew, of New Hampshire, to be Under Secretary of State?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, before the nomination is confirmed, I wish to say that I have no objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Grew to be Under Secretary of State. I have not been able to satisfy myself that haste should be exercised in confirming the nominations. If any Senator can give me a good reason for making haste in regard to this matter, I should like to hear what is the reason. For a long time I have heard that the State Department should be reorganized. I have personally believed that Mr. Hull was an understanding Secretary of State. I know that he is honest and patriotic. I know that he is a great American. I also know that he has always tried to the best of his ability to represent the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I sometimes wonder who won the election which we recently held. I was told that the poor folks would be given opportunities as the result of the election, and it was said that the common man would be given a better chance. I am certain that a great majority of the average citizens of the country voted for the reelection of President Roosevelt. Our Republican brethren

told us during the campaign that we would have to clear everything with Sidney. According to my understanding, Sidney has cleared out. He has gone to England, and he is advising everyone there about the standing of politicians, and what it means to take part in a political campaign in this country. Instead of poor folks obtaining jobs, the Wall Street boys are obtaining jobs, and we are clearing everything with Harry Hopkins. That may be the way the people voted, and it may be the way they intended to vote all the time. [Laughter.] Certainly that is the way it is being done.

Mr. President, I have nothing to say against any of the nominees. I have always had the greatest faith and confidence in Mr. Grew's ability as an ambassador. I think he made a fine record as our American Ambassador to Japan. I have read his books and some of his papers. He has appeared before our committee. I was very much impressed with him. The other men whose nominations have been proposed may do just as well as someone else could do. But what is the haste? Why can we not have a hearing and an opportunity to ask them some questions?

Mr. President, in the days ahead the United States Senate will be interested in trying to make arrangements with other nations of the world to answer the supreme question which is today being presented to mankind, namely, how to arrange for the nations of the earth to live together in peace. If we do not provide a correct answer to that important question, it is barely possible that within the next few years civilization may be entirely destroyed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who raised the question, is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. The nomination of Ambassador Grew was not reported today. It was reported yesterday. The Senator from Pennsylvania was present and voted, as I recall, to report the nomination to the Senate. There was no roll call. But he voted yesterday to report the nomination of Ambassador Grew.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I should like to correct the Senator from Missouri in the statement which he made. Were there not five or six members of the Foreign Relations Committee who reserved the right to vote as they pleased on each nomination as it came up on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me in order that I may reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I recall the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I do not like to detail in public an executive session of any committee, although I reserve the right

to do so—the only question raised had to do with Mr. MacLeish. The nomination of Mr. Grew was approved by unanimous consent in the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] objected to the confirmation of Mr. Clayton, and asked to be recorded against it. I objected to the confirmation of Mr. MacLeish, and at the suggestion of the chairman the roll was called, and four votes were recorded against that nomination. The Senator from Pennsylvania was present during a part of the meeting and voted for some of the confirmations, and then left, leaving his votes, with the understanding that they would be voted for all the confirmations.

Mr. President, what I should like to know is as to Mr. Grew, a career diplomat. What happened since yesterday morning, except the editorial of Dave Stern in the Philadelphia Record, to change anyone's opinion about the lifelong career of Ambassador Grew? That is all I want to ask.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have been a strong and staunch supporter of the President's foreign policy. I think he received more support from the American people because of his foreign policy than because of any other policy he advocated as President of the United States.

The men whose nominations we are considering are going to have the difficult task of making vital decisions on the foreign policy of this country during the ensuing important years which are immediately ahead of us, and the United States Senate is called upon to vote on the nominations. If Senators are going to vote knowing as little about these men as I do, then they will have to take the responsibility for the mistakes, if any are made, which these men may make. I confess that except as to Ambassador Grew I know very little about these nominees.

There are some questions I should like to have an opportunity to ask them. I should like to know what their views are on the economic problems of the world, and what sort of an economic policy we are to adopt in our dealings with other countries when the war is over.

I want to see a just peace, and an enduring peace, and I want to know what the ideas of these men are about that. I should like to know what they think about dictatorships. I should like to know how they acted on questions involving the war in Spain, and what their ideas were toward the Vichy Government. I should like to know what their position is with respect to India and the Far East. I should like to know whether they think the Atlantic Charter is dead, or whether or not in the future mankind will have an opportunity to be free because the Allies went to war.

All around the world, in the countries where people are slaves, they are today asking questions. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will recall people in some countries said, "The United States of America is bound by the Atlantic Charter." We cautioned them that that was a noble declaration of the President of the United States and of

the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and not to be too certain, because it was not the law of either country. They said, "Oh, but you are bound; we have a right to be free, and you are going to help make us free." When we asked them "Freedom from whom?" they would say freedom from one of the Allies. How is America to make those people free if Churchill says, "We mean to hold our own, unless you give us something that offers us an equally solid guaranty," when Churchill says, "I did not take this job to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. If that were ever prescribed, you would have to get somebody else for the job." If we are to say in the future to these people that this was a war between Fascists and imperialist powers, and that all the slaves have to look forward to is a return to slavery and their old masters, we have not done a thing but disillusion hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

American boys are again fighting and dying on a thousand fronts for democracy, the second time in a generation, and if all they are to accomplish is the securing of possessions all over the world for imperialist powers, and returning the people in those countries to slavery when the war is over, we will not have accomplished anything.

I do not know what the views of these nominees are about these matters. I am not making any attack against any man. I repeat, I do not know what these nominees stand for, but it does not occur to me that the question of confirmation is so important that we must make such haste that the Senate of the United States cannot take just a few hours. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations holds an executive session—and I do not have the honor of being a member of that committee—but they have one meeting, a closed session, and report these nominations to the Senate in one afternoon, without saying what these men stand for, and we are asked to vote to confirm the nominees to these important positions, and say to the world, "We have reorganized the State Department." There is already a dispatch or two from London stating that the British consider the first utterances of Secretary of State Stettinius insulting to them regarding British policy. I am not pleading for any unrealistic attitude. I do not consider it necessary to insult others, but we have to tell the truth, even if that may be insulting. I do not advocate being insulting to friends or allies, but I do advocate being realistic with them, and telling the truth.

Mr. President, I am not ready to vote today on two of these nominations. I think we would do well to take time. I think we would do well to importune the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ask him to call an open hearing of his committee, ask these men to appear, let Senators be present, and let other citizens of the Republic be present. Let us ask questions and ascertain, before we approve them for these important positions, how they stand on world cooperation, and what their ideas are about the world of tomorrow. I confess I do not know.

As quarterback on a football team, when I did not know what to do, I was always told we ought to kick. "When in doubt punt." So, if you are to compel me to vote against someone, I may do so to make a record, but I do not like to do that. I confess I do not know about these men, and I beg Senators to take time, and give us an opportunity to ascertain the facts, and then, when we find that we are ready, we can go ahead.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I find in the New York Times this morning a report with respect to the reorganization of the State Department in which there appear these two paragraphs:

In discussing his reorganization plans Mr. Stettinius said that they would include a realignment of functions.

He declined to discuss Mr. Clayton's views on cartels and other economic policies until after he assumed his new post in the State Department.

In the Washington Post this morning there was also a story about the same press conference, from which I read the following:

At Stettinius' news conference he was confronted with many questions on possible conflict between the views of Clayton on cartels in relation to those of President Roosevelt and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

It was that question which arose in the Foreign Relations Committee when MURRAY opposed recommendation of Clayton.

Stettinius, however, declined to speak for Clayton and said he would present him to the press at the first news conference after he takes office and let him speak for himself on the subject.

Mr. President, I am impressed by the assumption that information to the people of the United States with respect to the views of the nominee for this most important position, having to do with the economic relations of this Government to the rest of the world, will be postponed until after the Senate has acted upon the nomination, the assumption being that the Senate is willing to act without information.

Are we to have the people of the country understand that while newspaper correspondents may confront the Secretary of State at his press conference and ask him for the views and opinions of a subordinate—about-to-be—with respect to this most serious of all economic problems, Members of the Senate are asked to hold their curiosity in leash until Mr. Clayton appears at a State Department press conference after he has been confirmed?

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Foreign Relations Committee is going to ask the Senate to vote blindly about so important a matter, and I say this without the slightest reflection upon Mr. Clayton, the nominee. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Clayton's ability. I have seen him in action before committees of the Senate. I admire his poise, I admire his patience, I admire his competence, but I know nothing whatsoever about his views on international trade, and I know, Mr. President, that we are engaged in this war because political leadership and business leadership have been incompetent to deal with the question of international cartels. We are in this war, Mr. President, precisely be-

cause opportunity to make a living has not been granted to the masses of the people of the world because the control of economics has been held in the hands of a few leaders.

We had the German cartels, we had the British cartels, we had American participation in cartels. We know that the handling of the cartels is a major part of post-war policy; but we know nothing about what this reorganization of the State Department means with respect to any phase of international policy. Every Member of the Senate had a very good notion of what Secretary Cordell Hull's policy was. We were never in any doubt about that, nor was the world in doubt about it. But since the change in the Department of State, no word has issued from any quarter telling the Members of the Senate, or the people of the United States, or the people of the world, what the policy of the reorganized State Department will be with respect to these fundamental problems of how to enable the nations and the peoples of the world to live together.

There was presented to the Senate some time before the election a treaty having to do with petroleum and petroleum resources. My own opinion with respect to that agreement was that it was not a treaty but an agreement to make an agreement. I felt sure that it dealt solely with foreign oil. But it was not altogether clear.

Mr. President, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of State with respect to that treaty, and I received a response from him. I did not make my letter public nor his response. Since that time, however, there has been a great change. I did not make the exchange public because I felt that further negotiations were to take place and I knew how Secretary Hull thinks. Now he has retired and the State Department is being reorganized to what end?

Last Sunday the newspapers carried the announcement that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not feel that the oil treaty with Great Britain should be ratified. I gained the impression that perhaps there may be a new agreement, a new treaty. I do not know what the terms of the new negotiation will be. If we act today upon these nominees we know that the framing of those terms will be in the hands of these gentlemen whose nominations we are now asked to confirm, but whose views are not revealed to us.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we are dealing here with one of the very basic questions of the war and of the peace, and I feel very, very deeply that the Senate should not act until its Committee on Foreign Relations has brought these men before it so that we may know what policies they intend to follow, and whether there is to be any change.

We hear a great deal about the desirability of cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government. We hear a great deal of criticism of the executive branch for taking things into his own hands. But is this not an example of how the legislative body turns responsibility over to the Ex-

ecutive and makes it impossible for the Executive to do anything but act? If the Senate does not exercise the responsibility which the Constitution gives it to advise and consent by confirming appointees who are to occupy positions of the gravest responsibility by acquainting itself with the policies of policy-making officers, then surely we cannot avoid the charge of having failed to do our full duty.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that there will be no action upon any of these nominees until the Foreign Relations Committee can give us more information with respect to what their views are.

We should not be made dependent upon some future press conference for information which it is our constitutional right, and I think duty, to secure before we act.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator apply that to the nomination of Ambassador Grew?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I see no reason why there should be any exception. Personally I have the greatest confidence in Mr. Grew. I have listened to him before committees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, since the Under Secretary of State has been promoted to the position of Secretary of State, there is a very great necessity for having an experienced diplomat who would be in a position to run the ordinary business of the State Department, and I see a very great difference between the situation of Ambassador Grew, who has been nominated to be Under Secretary of State, and the nomination of others to be Assistant Secretaries. In other words, if the confirmation of Ambassador Grew as Under Secretary could be brought about so that he could immediately begin to regulate the affairs of the Department—and I think there is no one on either side of this body who questions his ability to do that—then I am prepared to offer a motion to refer the nominations of the others to be Assistant Secretaries back to the Foreign Relations Committee for the purpose of holding hearings. But I do not see how the Department can possibly function without the confirmation of the nomination of the Under Secretary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Department has functioned without an Under Secretary until today, and I think it may very well function until next week if that necessity arises. The question involved would be merely that of administration. Mr. President, I am talking about questions of the very highest possible international policy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator from Wyoming. As I said, I am prepared to offer a motion to recommit the nominations of Assistant Secretaries of State to the Committee on Foreign Relations. But I do think that the new Secretary of State is entitled to have an experienced diplomat at his right hand to conduct the affairs of the Department, and I do not think

there is anyone on either side of this Chamber who is prepared to oppose confirmation of Ambassador Grew.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Secretary have authority to designate someone in the Department to act temporarily as Under Secretary of State?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would assume that that Department is not different from other departments, and that such authority does exist.

Mr. President, I was about to call attention to the Atlantic Charter. I have sent this charter to innumerable constituents because I have felt it to be a declaration of American policy, I have felt it to be a declaration of American ideals, I have felt it to be a declaration of meaning; and yet we all know that all through the world today doubts are being cast upon the principles which were outlined in that charter, signed in the Atlantic by Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the President of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Are there not doubts in the minds of some persons that there ever was any such thing? A search has recently been made, and the so-called document known as the Atlantic Charter cannot be found.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hold in my hand House Document No. 358 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. It is a message of the President of the United States to the Congress, and it transmits the Atlantic Charter. If there be any doubt about the existence of this document, Mr. President, I ask that it be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships, and their personnel, no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lend-Lease Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies, which east and west are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept com-

promise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia, to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 21, 1941.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not there ever was any Atlantic Charter drawn up and signed by the President and Mr. Churchill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The statement in the President's message, after the preliminaries, is as follows:

They have agreed—

"They" being the President and the Prime Minister—

upon the following joint declaration—

Then follows the text of the Atlantic Charter, and beneath that text appear the names of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, with the word "signed" in parentheses before each name. I regard this as substantial evidence that there is such a document.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator ever seen any signed document, or has he ever seen anyone who claims to have seen it? I never have. I have made inquiry. I am asking only for information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have never made any inquiry. I have never attempted to see the original document.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has never seen any original document?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume there is one, but I do not know.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator ever seen anyone else who has seen it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have never inquired.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say to the Senator that I have made inquiry. I have never seen it, and I have never seen any living human who has seen it. Some day I should like to find out whether it was merely words, or whether it was a signed document. If anyone has such information, I wish he would give it to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words.

Among the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter was the following; namely, the first declaration of the Atlantic Charter:

Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

That was a noble declaration. We hear reports, however, that some of the

nations involved in this war are seeking territorial aggrandizement.

I shall not attempt to read all these items. I shall be content to have the document printed at large in the RECORD. I cite it, Mr. President, only as additional evidence that the Senate, before it acts on the confirmation of any of these nominations, should at least have additional evidence with respect to the point of view of these gentlemen on the problems with which they will have to deal on behalf of all the people of the United States. I therefore hope that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be willing to sustain a motion to return all these nominations to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming makes a rather unusual request. The Committee on Foreign Relations has had these nominations before it for consideration. We considered them yesterday. Any Senator was welcome to come before the committee and file objections against any of these nominees. The Senator from Texas, as chairman of the committee, will not assume the responsibility of vetoing the action of his committee and saying, "We will consider them again." The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was present and participated in the deliberations of the committee.

The Senator from Wyoming says that he does not know how Mr. Clayton stands with respect to cartels. That is a very simple matter. The Senator can call him on the telephone in about a minute, and he can say "Yes" or "No."

We have not yet reached Mr. Clayton's name, but he has been in the Government service for some time. He has been before congressional committees repeatedly. His background and history are well known to everyone who wishes to know about him.

Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming if Mr. Clayton did not appear before his committee, the Temporary National Economic Committee, which held hearings awhile ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He may have been a witness before that committee. I do not recall that he appeared with respect to any important study. He has appeared very recently before other committees of the Senate, including the Committee on Military Affairs. Inasmuch as the Senator has addressed the inquiry to me, let me point out to him again that it is not a question of what I know about Mr. Clayton's policies with respect to cartels. It is a question of what the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, does not know, if he is correctly quoted in this morning's newspapers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Clayton will be an Assistant Secretary. Over him will be the Under Secretary. Over the Under Secretary will be the Secretary, and over him will be the President of the United States. So Mr. Clayton will have to be a powerful man to control the policies of the Department with regard to cartels. Of course, we are not in favor of cartels; and I do not suppose that Mr. Clayton is in favor of cartels. I think it is an unfair

assumption to believe that he is in favor of cartels because he has not said that he is against them.

Personally I am not in favor of returning these nominations to the committee. We acted on information which we thought was sufficient. If the Senate wishes to send the nominations back to the committee, of course it can do so, and we shall have a hearing; and aside from the membership of the committee, not three Senators will be present to hear all the information which the Senator from Wyoming is so anxious to secure at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that these four nominations be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration, and for the presentation of testimony by these four gentlemen.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask to modify the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. I realize that it is a violation of the rules, except by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Joseph C. Grew, of New Hampshire; W. L. Clayton, of Texas; Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York; and Archibald MacLeish, of Virginia, be considered together, and be subject to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot give my consent to the request of the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that if the nominations are to be sent back to the committee, which I favor, they should be sent back together.

Mr. CONNALLY. All of them?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All of them. I believe that is the intention of the Senator from Wyoming. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That all should be sent back?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That all should be sent back for further consideration. Is that the intention of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask to modify the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, which could apply at the moment only to the nomination of Ambassador Grew, so as to apply to all four nominations. Otherwise it will be my intention to make a separate motion as to each nomination as it comes up. It seems to me that we might save a great deal of time by sending them back en bloc, rather than waiting for a separate motion on each nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the motion now is that they all be sent back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I have no right to modify the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CONNALLY. He included them all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri to modify the motion of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming had already made substantially the same motion.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has worked very diligently and carefully, not only in this matter, but in other matters. For more than 2 years that committee and its subcommittees have been unusually active and attentive to their duties.

We have done the best we know how on these nominations. If the Senate thinks we have been remiss, that we have been negligent, that we have not attended to our functions, that it has no confidence in what we do, then let the Senate recommit the nominations to the committee.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has said, "Oh, why the hurry about it?" Mr. President, we are not in a hurry. But the Committee on Foreign Relations undertakes, when business is submitted to it, to give it attention and to act. There are a considerable number of trash cans around the Capitol, where things can be put and where they will stay forever. The Committee on Foreign Relations is not such a receptacle. We try to do business.

If the Senate wishes to send the nominations back to the committee, I do not know when we will be able to report them again. But if everyone wishes to know what all the nominees think about everything on earth, Mr. President, the nominations very likely will be in the committee a good while.

So I hope the Senate will not recommit the nominations to the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In case the motion made by the Senator from Wyoming should be defeated, would it be in order to make a separate motion concerning the nominations as they were presented, *seriatim*?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be. The Chair will state that the motion of the Senator from Wyoming is hardly in order, because only one nomination is before the Senate at this time, namely, the nomination of Joseph C. Grew.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I thought the pending question was the one I presented as a unanimous-consent request, namely, that the four nominations be joined into one for the purpose of the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. That certainly was my intention.

I now ask unanimous consent that the nominations of the four nominees for positions in the State Department be joined into one for the purpose of the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. That was the purpose of the suggestion I made a while ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about the present situation. I wish to have it known that I am not in favor of recommitting the nominations to the Committee on For-

eign Relations. So far as I am concerned I know enough about these men to determine my attitude toward them and toward their nominations as sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

First of all, let me emphasize that, as the Senator from Texas has already said, these nominees will not be the men who will determine the foreign policy of the United States. They will be subordinates who will carry out the policies determined by the President of the United States. They will speak for him. They will speak in behalf of the policies upon which he determines, and which he seeks to effectuate.

Mr. President, I know something about at least two of the nominees. I know Joseph Grew. He has lived in the white light of publicity for a quarter of a century in the Foreign Service of the United States. He has built his life and his character in this period of time, and today he stands before the American people subject to no legitimate attack from any source.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me.

Mr. President, I do not care very much about what Joseph Grew may now think about some policy or some perplexing question which may arise for decision in the future. I do know Joseph Grew. I am more interested in the fact that the President has named a man of ability, a man of character, than I am in what he might decide about some question which might arise in the 2 or 3 or 4 years ahead of us.

And I know Nelson Rockefeller. He is a young man who has lived all his life under the shadow of a great name. His grandfather was one of the greatest industrialists of the Nation and of the world, and his father has been a great philanthropist, a man of culture, a man of education, a man who has lived in the best traditions of our country, who has poured out his money in an almost inexhaustible stream for the welfare of the manhood and the youth and the traditions of this Nation. Nelson Rockefeller has lived a life of effort and achievement. He has my respect and my confidence.

So far as I am concerned—I have said this before, but I wish to repeat it—I am more interested in the character of the nominees than I am in anything they may think about some problem which may hereafter arise.

In the committee I voted on the nominations. I believe I voted as I should have voted. I stand on what I have done. I personally do not welcome a return of the nominations to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise only to make it perfectly plain that nothing I have said should be interpreted by anyone as in any degree critical of the character or ability of any of the nominees. I will echo everything the Senator from Maine has said with respect to the character of Mr. Grew. I will say

the same with respect to each of the other nominees.

But the pending question is not a question of character, Mr. President. The pending question is a question of the public policy of the United States. When we discharge our constitutional duty of confirming the nominations sent to us by the President—in the present case, nominations for positions in the Department of State—we share a public responsibility in determining what the policy is to be. It is only upon the ground of policy, Mr. President, that I have made the motion to send the nominations back to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, every Senator who knows the President of the United States must realize that he is going to dominate the foreign policy of this Government. We already have a Secretary of State who, of course, will be the representative of the President. But it is peculiarly the function of the President of the United States to deal with our foreign relations. It is a long stretch of the imagination for anyone to think that an Assistant Secretary of State will be more than an administrative officer in carrying out the policies which will be announced and adopted by those in higher positions.

If the Senate recommit the nominations to the Committee on Foreign Relations, all it will do will be simply to delay matters for a few days.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In thinking about the position of the committee of which the Senator is the chairman, I now ask him this question: If the Senate should recommit the nominations to the committee, in the light of the discussion which has occurred in the Senate would not the chairman of the committee practically feel instructed to call the nominees before the committee and hold an open hearing on the subject of the nominations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not consider it an instruction; but, as the Senator has suggested, I would feel that the Senate wished to hear from these gentlemen, and we would have to call them before the committee and interrogate them and have their testimony taken down, and then call the other Senators down there and tell them what the nominees had said.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. In case anyone has doubt about that, let me say that is precisely what I had in mind. I had expected that, if the motion prevailed, the committee would call the nominees before it for a public hearing and would ask everyone to be present.

Of course, if they are going to be stooges—and the Senator has made the statement that they will not do anything—I would hate to be a party to advising and consenting to the nomination of a stooge who would not do anything when he assumed the office.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, Mr. President, I suppose the Senator has some

stooges in his office or around somewhere.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas probably knows more about stooges than I would know.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, Mr. President, the Senator brought up that subject.

Of course, if the Senate recommit the nominations to the committee, the committee will call the nominees before it. But I do not believe many Senators will be present in the committee to question them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a record of what is said in the committee, would be made, would it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; a record could be taken down.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A record is made of the proceedings of almost all committee hearings, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. President, in that event, we would have a hearing and we would have the proceedings printed in English. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, first, I will respond to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky. The proceeding which has been suggested is an unusual one. I do not know of any committee which has ever been told by the Senate, "We are going to send these nominations back to you, and we are going to tell you in detail what you are to do. You must bring the nominees before you, and you must ask them these questions: 'Where do you reside? What is your name? What are you doing? What are you going to do?'"

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I do not know what the men would do, but I know that the Senate would be responsible for their conduct if it should vote to approve them. If within the next few months the policy of the United States is changed because of what may be done by some of these nominees about whom we do not now know, we shall be responsible for it, and no one will be on hand to hold our heads when they start aching. I do not intend to allow mine to ache.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator's head will not have any cause to ache, because he does not worry about anything.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator that if a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations is held I shall be glad to appear at the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that the Senator is in a position to leave the Military Affairs Committee at any time and take over the functions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to take over the functions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I could protest regarding the diligence of the Senator's committee. Recently I submitted a resolution asking that Secretary of State Hull be given an honorary medal. I do not know what the committee did with the resolution. I do not know where the resolution is now resting.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator can come to the committee and get the resolution at any time he so desires.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Kentucky comes for it, he will ask for it, but he may not get it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I know the Senator will do whatever he thinks best. It is true that a resolution was submitted by the Senator from Kentucky to honor former Secretary of State Hull by giving him a medal. It would be a Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution does not contain anything about the medal being a Congressional Medal of Honor. It merely refers to it as a medal of honor. I assume that if the resolution were agreed to, the medal would contain some reference to its being a Congressional Medal of Honor. However, I believe that Mr. Cordell Hull would be entitled to a military medal if it were possible to give him one.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Texas knows something about the record of Cordell Hull. He served in the House of Representatives with him for 10 years, and for a number of years he served with him in the Senate. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I had dealings with Mr. Hull two or three times a week for a long while. I am not exaggerating when I say that I believe I know as much about the former Secretary of State as does the Senator from Kentucky, who has been a Member of the Senate for only a short time. I do not question the Senator's knowledge regarding all those matters, but I do not want him to reflect on the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not intend to reflect on the Senator from Texas, because he is as smart as any man can be. If I had served as long as Cordell Hull has served, I might know as much as he knows. I regret that I have not had the opportunity to serve as long as he has served.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky would have learned considerable. I know that in any intellectual contest I would not be able to compete with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I regard this as a very unusual proceeding, without any consideration being given for the time of the Senate. We considered these nominations promptly. We thought the Senate wanted promptness. I ask the Senate not to return the nominations to the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was in attendance at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee at the time this matter was being considered. My objection to the action of the committee as to the confirmation of Mr. Clayton was based on the fact that I had no knowledge or information regarding his views on the subject of international cartels. I have no personal objections to Mr. Clayton. I regard him as a man of high integrity and unusual ability. It seems to me, however, that when his nomination comes before us for appointment to a position of the character in-

volved, the Members of the Senate should know what his attitude is on such an important question as international cartels. Mr. Clayton has come to be recognized as one of the outstanding businessmen of the United States. The general impression is that because of his international interests he would be in favor of international cartels. The reason I voted against his confirmation—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did the Senator just say? Did he say the presumption is that Mr. Clayton favors international cartels?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I stated that it was the general impression that because of his interests in international trade he might favor international cartels.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator just said that he had no knowledge about it.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. That is the reason I voted against the nomination, because I did not know what the attitude of Mr. Clayton was or that subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. Merely because the Senator did not know, then he thinks Mr. Clayton must be in favor of cartels. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. No; not at all. I opposed the nomination because I had no knowledge or information with reference to what his attitude may be on these public questions. I think we should know exactly how he stands on these matters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think that the attitudes of the persons whose nominations the Senate has been asked to confirm should be developed before we confirm them?

Mr. MURRAY. I think we should have some understanding of what their attitude may be. I do not agree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in his statement that the entire international program is to be placed in the hands of the President, that he will direct everything, and that these men will be acting merely in the capacity of carrying out his directions. I assume that they will be persons of importance in formulating policies, and that they will act as his advisers on matters pertaining to international affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator from Montana in favor of international cartels?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I am not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Neither am I.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the reason I voted against the recommendation of the committee in this matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If these men were only to carry out the wishes of the President of the United States, then certainly he would not need as many persons in the Department of State as there now are. The men whose nominations we

are asked to confirm are supposed to be experts and advisers of the President on foreign policy.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Montana is exactly correct.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know what the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee is, and I do not want to try to tell the committee what it should do, but certainly when a nomination comes before the Interstate Commerce Committee for consideration; we ask the person to come before the committee and subject himself to questions, and we endeavor to find out something about him. I know Mr. Grew, and I have a high regard for him. I have known him for a long time. But I certainly do not know anything about the views of some of the men whose nominations have been sent to the Senate.

Reference has been made to the Democrats. Suppose we had a Republican administration, and the name of Mr. Stettinius was sent to us for confirmation. The administration might send the nomination of Mr. Rockefeller, or the nomination of Mr. Clayton. What would we Democrats do? I have been a Member of the Senate for more than 20 years. When Mr. Hoover sent up to the Senate a nomination in the way in which these nominations have been sent, the Democrats seriously questioned the appointments.

We now have what is supposed to be a great liberal administration. Someone has said that it was an administration of the common people, or of the poor people. Yet, we know that the heads of all the various departments are representatives of the big business interests of the country. They represent the Morgan interests, the Rockefeller interests, the Dillon-Reed interests, and all the big corporations of the country at the present time. We are not to question the nominations which have been sent to us. As to what the views of the nominees may be, or their sentiments with regard to various matters, we are to know nothing. I submit that we should know something about them before we vote on them, and I shall not vote for them until I do know something about them.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I fully agree with the observations of my colleague and the considerations he has stated were what influenced me at the time this matter was before the Committee on Foreign Relations. If we are to have a reorganization of the State Department, I cannot understand why we should not know who the people are who are to be placed in control of that Department, and who are to formulate and carry out the policies of the Department. It seems to me we should have a full hearing in this matter, and that the public should have an opportunity to know who these nominees are, and their opinions with reference to foreign questions.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if the Senate compels me to vote on these nominations this afternoon, I shall support all of them, because I know of no reason for not giving them support, but

I shall take a minute or two of the Senate's time to express the hope that the motion of the Senator from Wyoming will be agreed to.

I think the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has not quite met its responsibility in reporting the nominations of four men who did not appear before the committee. There may not be any brighter or better men than these. On the other hand, there might be men who are a little better fitted for these particular assignments.

I have not been able to arouse much enthusiasm within myself over the appointments for the State Department which have come to the Senate.

Perhaps that mere sentence is an injustice to the nominees, but I think we are entitled to a little more than we have received. I think the Committee on Foreign Relations should be willing to have these nominations go back, and at least an opportunity given to doubtful Senators to interrogate the nominees as to their views on the very important matters with which they will deal in these very unusual and dangerous times. I do not think there should be any reluctance on the part of any member of the committee to take a little more time in dealing with this important matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DANAHER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Chair please state the motion of the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has moved that the nominations, all four of them, be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further study and consideration.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Wyoming accept a modification of his motion, to sever the name of Mr. Grew?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That question has already been decided in the negative by the author of the motion.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it seemed to me that there might be much merit in severing Mr. Grew's name from the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, if for no other reason than on the ground that for 11 months he was warning the entire country, including the State Department, of the impending possibility of war with Japan. It would be a novelty to have a man like that in the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily detained from the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay" on the pending motion.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote, if present and voting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 37, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—37

Alken	Holman	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Jenner	Overton
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Chandler	Langer	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Cordon	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Mead	Willis
Guffey	Millikin	
Hall	Murray	

NAYS—27

Austin	Caraway	Gerry
Bailey	Connally	Green
Ball	Davis	Gurney
Burton	Eastland	Hatch
Capper	Ellender	Hawkes

Hill	O'Daniel	Tydings
Lucas	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McClellan	Revercomb	Weeks
McKellar	Thomas, Okla.	White

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	McCarran	Tobey
Bridges	Moore	Truman
Brooks	Murdoch	Tunnell
Byrd	Nye	Wallgren
Chavez	Pepper	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Wiley
Downey	Reynolds	Wilson
George	Scrugham	
Gillette	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 37—

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the result is announced I should like to ask, Did the senior Senator from New York understand the question?

Mr. CHANDLER. A point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. That it was to send all these nominations back to the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Chair had started to announce the result, and he should proceed with the announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 37 and the nays are 27; and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

Vice Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of January 1942.

Vice Admiral Willis A. Lee, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of March 1944.

Vice Admiral Theodore S. Wilkinson, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 12th day of August 1944.

Capt. Ralph S. Riggs, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of June 1943.

Capt. Bernard L. Austin, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff, to the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Areas.

Commodore Ellery W. Stone, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief Commissioner of the Allied Mediterranean Commission.

Rear Admiral Wilson Brown, United States Navy, when retired on December 1, 1944, to

be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of vice admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James Hugh Kelley, Jr.
William E. DeCourcy

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Hartwell Johnson
Harry M. Donaldson

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Albert M. Doyle
Paul P. Steintorf
Lewis Clark
William M. Gwynn
Paul C. Squire
James R. Wilkinson

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A. John Cope, Jr.
J. Ramon Solana

TO BE A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert M. Taylor

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Wilhelm Delp Styer

To be major generals

James Maurice Gavin
Clarence Ames Martin
Orvil Arson Anderson
John Y. York, Jr.
Robert Morris Webster
Kenneth Bonner Wolfe
Leo Donovan
Harry Briggs Vaughan
Arthur Arnim White
Willard Gordon Wyman
Wilton Burton Persons
James Edmund Parker
Frank Emil Stoner
Russel Burton Reynolds
Julian Sommerville Hatcher
Clyde Lloyd Hyssong
William Howard Arnold
Royal Bertrand Lord
James Alward Van Fleet
Carl Adolphus Hardigg
William Richard Arnold
Otto Lauren Nelson, Jr.

To be brigadier generals

William Thaddeus Sexton
Josiah Toney Dalbey
Francis Kosier Newcomer
Robert Reese Neyland, Jr.
Clyde Davis Eddleman
Walter Edwin Todd
Robert Ward Berry
Morrill Watson Marston
Hugh Bryan Hester
Matthew John Gunner
John Andrews Rogers
Jack Weston Wood
Walter Joseph Muller
Fenton Stratton Jacobs
Herbert Bernard Loper
James Michael Fitzmaurice
Carroll Arthur Powell
Roy William Grower
William Joseph Morrissey
Joseph James O'Hare

William Leclé Lee
 John Moore Thompson
 Kendall Jordan Fielder
 Francis Andrew March
 Lewis Tenney Ross
 Charles Frederick Colson
 Halley Grey Maddox
 Edmund Clayton Lynch
 Neal Henry McKay
 John Howell Collier
 Ralph Julian Canine
 Wayne Carleton Smith
 Clyde Massey
 John Paul Doyle
 Francis Augustus Englehart
 Bruce Cooper Clarke
 Emil Lenzner
 Leroy Hugh Watson
 James Creel Marshall
 Robinson Earl Duff
 William Albert Collier
 Sumner Waite
 Julian Merritt Chappell
 William Franklin Campbell
 John Ter Bush Bissell
 Carter Weldon Clarke
 Ford Larimore Fair
 George Foreman Rixey
 Urban Niblo
 Crump Garvin
 Harry Howard Baird
 James Stevenson Rodwell
 Emery Scott Wetzel
 Harold Loring Mace
 Harold Alling McGinnis
 Harold Eugene Eastwood
 Hammond McDougal Monroe
 Francis Gerard Brink
 Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr.
 Ernest Aaron Bixby
 John Harold Wilson
 Charles Heyward Barnwell, Jr.
 Ralph Adel Snavely

To be a major general

William Joseph Donovan

To be brigadier generals

Robert Wilbar Wilson
 L. Kemper Williams
 Frederick Walker Castle
 Archie J. Old, Jr.
 David Sarnoff
 Timothy James Manning
 William Andros Barron, Jr.
 Oscar Nathaniel Solbert
 John Adams Appleton
 Rudolph Charles Kuldell

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Stanley Lonzo Scott, Corps of Engineers.
 Henry Crampton Jones, Field Artillery.
 Carl Lee Marriott, Chemical Warfare Service, subject to examination required by law.
 James Arthur Pickering, Field Artillery.
 James Knox Cockrell, Cavalry.
 William Spence, Field Artillery.
 Willis McDonald Chapin, Coast Artillery Corps.

Fred Beeler Inglis, Field Artillery.
 Robert Bruce McBride, Jr., Field Artillery.
 Paul Vincent Kane, Field Artillery.
 DeRosey Carroll Cabell, Ordnance Department.

William Ewen Shipp, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels

John James Baker, Infantry.
 George Louis Boyle, Finance Department.
 Robert Brice Johnston, Quartermaster Corps.
 Paul Ainsworth Berkey, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
 Dana Gray McBride, Cavalry.
 Donald Boyer Phillips, Air Corps.
 William Wallace Robertson, Infantry.
 William Peyton Campbell, Finance Department.
 Harry Starkey Aldrich, Coast Artillery Corps.

Hugh Perry Adams, Field Artillery.
 Cecil Elmore Archer, Air Corps.
 Thomas Edward Moore, Field Artillery.
 Stephen Yates McGiffert, Field Artillery.
 John Otis Hyatt, Quartermaster Corps.
 Louis Meline Merrick, Air Corps.
 Lee Roy Woods, Jr., Finance Department.
 Rox Hunter Donaldson, Field Artillery.
 Dudley Warren Watkins, Air Corps.
 Arthur Nathaniel Willis, Cavalry.
 Lyman Perley Whitten, Air Corps.
 Ray Henry Clark, Air Corps.
 Homer Wilbur Ferguson, Air Corps.
 James Richmond Simpson, Infantry.
 Philip Schwartz, Ordnance Department.
 Richard Brown Thornton, Quartermaster Corps.

Pacifico Castor Sevilla, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.
 Charles Nicholas Senn Ballou, Infantry.
 Samuel Rubin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Walden Sharp Lewis, Infantry.
 Andrew Julius Evans, Infantry.
 Donald McKechnie Ashton, Infantry.
 Edward Alfred Mueller, Quartermaster Corps.

Robert William Calvert Wimsatt, Air Corps.
 Amado Martelino, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

Victor Zalamea Gomez, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.
 Clayton Huddle Studebaker, Field Artillery.

Albert James Wick, Quartermaster Corps.
 Raymond Taylor Tompkins, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
 George Alfred Arnold Jones, Field Artillery.

George Evans Burritt, Field Artillery.
 William Madison Mack, Signal Corps.
 Walter Jesse Klepinger, Field Artillery.
 Frank Charles McConnell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Donald Fowler Fritch, Air Corps.
 James Madison Callicutt, Field Artillery.
 Reginald Pond Lyman, Signal Corps.
 John Sharpe Griffith, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Pio Quevedo Caluya, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.
 George Work Marvin, Corps of Engineers.

To be first lieutenants

Charles Adam Ott, Jr., Field Artillery.
 Richard Gates Davis, Corps of Engineers.

To be colonels

David Loran Robeson, Medical Corps.
 Joseph Ignatius Martin, Medical Corps.
 Thomas Randolph McCauley, Medical Corps.
 Lester Eastwood Beringer, Medical Corps.
 John Moorhaj Tamraz, Medical Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels

John Morris Hargreaves, Medical Corps.
 Don Longfellow, Medical Corps.
 William Frank DeWitt, Medical Corps.

To be majors

Max Naimark, Medical Corps.
 Vernon James Erkenbeck, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
 Arthur Herbert Thompson, Medical Corps.
 Wilson Theodore Smith, Medical Corps.
 Clarendon Barron Woods, Medical Corps.
 Joe Alexander Bain, Medical Corps.
 Cecil Spencer Mollohan, Medical Corps.
 Francis Whitney Hall, Medical Corps.

To be captains

Todd Merriam Mulford, Medical Corps.
 Joseph Edward Walther, Medical Corps.
 Fred Ries Sloan, Medical Corps.
 Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, Medical Corps.
 Hamilton Boyd, Jr., Medical Corps.
 John Sidney Clapp, Medical Corps.
 Emil Joseph Genetti, Medical Corps.
 Vernon Charles Kelly, Medical Corps.
 Robert Richard Jones, Medical Corps.
 Augustus Lynn Baker, Jr., Medical Corps.
 Thompson Eldridge Potter, Medical Corps.

Herman Saul Wigodsky, Medical Corps.
 Camp Stanley Huntington, Medical Corps.

To be colonels

Vivian Z. Brown, Dental Corps.
 Clarence Roy Benney, Dental Corps.
 Nathan Menzo Neate, Veterinary Corps.
 John MacWilliams (chaplain), United States Army.
 Roy Hartford Parker (chaplain), United States Army.

To be a lieutenant colonel

Walter Edwin Chase, Dental Corps.

To be captains

Randolph Lynn Gregory (chaplain), United States Army.
 Arthur Henry Marsh (chaplain), United States Army.

To be a first lieutenant

Kenneth Oswald Due, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.

To be majors

Joseph Sibley Cirlot, Medical Corps.
 Richard Howard Eckhardt, Medical Corps.
 John Mars Caldwell, Jr., Medical Corps.
 Charles Parmalee Ward, Medical Corps.
 Elmer Arthur Lodmell, Medical Corps.
 Lester Paul Veigel, Medical Corps.
 George Lewis Beatty, Medical Corps.
 Harold Irvin Amory, Medical Corps.
 John Albert Egan, Medical Corps.
 George Gustavo Guiteras, Medical Corps.
 Edgar Louis Olson, Medical Corps.
 Charles Edwards Spellman, Medical Corps.
 Joe Harrell, Medical Corps.

To be a captain

Bruce Hardy Bennett, Medical Corps.

To be a lieutenant colonel

Edward Martin Wones, Pharmacy Corps.

To be a colonel

Willis Timmons Howard (chaplain), United States Army

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. John Francis Farra, Jr.

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Harry Paller
 First Lt. Frank George White
To Signal Corps
 First Lt. Donald Read Bodine
 First Lt. George William Rhyne

To Field Artillery

Second Lt. Jack Teague

To Infantry

First Lt. John Joseph Pavick

To Air Corps

First Lt. Andrew D'Elia
 Second Lt. Donald Hepburn Bruner

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Elmer Freas Crutchfield, Batesville.
 Sara M. Higginbottom, Wickes.
 Simon O. Norris, Williford.

INDIANA

Wanda R. Barnett, Michigantown.
 Vern Hahn, Wakarusa.

LOUISIANA

Edward P. Terrell, Jr., Avery Island.
 Cleora W. Charleville, Cloutierville.
 Adina M. Edwards, Noble.
 Monroe Erskins, Sikes.
 Carl E. Blackwell, Simpson.

WISCONSIN

Jules G. Pierre, Brussels.
 George V. Carolan, Glenbeulah.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Ellery W. Stone, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

POSTMASTER

MISSOURI

Rachel Elgiva McCracken to be postmaster at Calt, Mo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, out of Thy infinite fountain of mercy, opened by Thy loving heart and brought near to us by the sacrificial death of our Saviour, grant us the treasures of wisdom, righteousness, and self-control. Bring our hearts under the influence of the Divine Presence, hallowing our affections and sanctifying our responsibilities. Keep our minds in unshaken faith, in the wonder of Thy Fatherhood, and under the calming rest of that spirit that bids the troubled waters die. "Be not afraid, lo, it is I."

Brighten all our course that we may irradiate the lives of the lowly and comfort the sorrowing; with Thine own consolations do Thou give them the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness that cares and anxieties may cease to gnaw. O Son of Man, whose message is to those who bleed and suffer and most assuredly for our wounded soldiers, may they never hunger nor yield to despair because of us. O walk the battlefields, through the hospitals, and in the homes; with Thy presence give them new wills, fresh visions, and the blessing of a new-found joy. By the countless crosses and stars round which the winds sigh and moan and by the eternal law of love by which the world alone can be saved, O summon us to a deeper self-effacement. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; and

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Labor.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Department of War.
8. Government Printing Office.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2185) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

GRANTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR PETROLEUM PIPE LINES, TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH LINES WITHIN AREA OF INDIAN ROCK DAM, YORK COUNTY, PA.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5219) to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa., and its immediate consideration. I may say that I have discussed this matter with the majority leaders. The bill has a favorable report from the War Department, from the Petroleum Administrator for War, and from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consulted with the Members who may be interested?

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have written letters to all of the official objectors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the legislation requested?

Mr. DISNEY. The Sinclair Pipe Line Co. was acquiring and had acquired a

large amount of right-of-way for the building of a war pipe line from Steubenville, Ohio, to Marcus Hook, N. J., and thence down to Baltimore. During that process the Government started to condemn lands in this Indian reservation for a reservoir in Pennsylvania. The Sinclair Co. then disclaimed and deeded their rights-of-way to the Government. The Secretary of War granted one of these 5-year easements, which is non-extendable. The only way in which they can continue is to have action by Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the War Department is agreeable to the legislation.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, to grant to Sinclair Refining Co., a Maine corporation, its successors and assigns, an easement for rights-of-way for pipe lines for the transportation of crude petroleum and/or the products and/or byproducts thereof, and also for telegraph and/or telephone lines, for use in connection with the operation of such pipe line or pipe lines, over, through, under, and across all those certain lands of the United States embraced in what is known as Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir Area in the county of York, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: *Provided*, That such easement shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will not substantially injure the interests of the United States in the property affected thereby, and will not be incompatible with the public interest: *And provided further*, That all or any part of such easement may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War after reasonable notice (a) for failure of said Sinclair Refining Co., or its successors or assigns, to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant made hereunder or (b) for abandonment of such easement: *And provided further*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the comma, insert "under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was visiting some of my constituents at Walter Reed Hospital when the record vote on H. R. 5564, pursuant to House

Resolution 667, was taken on roll call No. 120, and if I had been present I would have voted with my 72 colleagues who voted against this proposal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5543) extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (relating to the release of certain powers of appointment) is amended by striking out "January 1, 1945" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release before July 1, 1945:

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before July 1, 1945, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1945 and to that part of the calendar year 1945 prior to July 1, 1945."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 162 (d) (1) (B) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (relating to employees' trusts) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) such a plan shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) for the period beginning with the beginning of the first taxable year following December 31, 1942, and ending March 15, 1945, if the provisions thereof satisfy such requirements by March 15, 1945, and if by that time all provisions of such plan which are necessary to satisfy such requirements are in effect and have been made effective for all purposes with respect to the portion of such period after December 31, 1943."

(b) Section 162 (d) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (relating to employees' trusts) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing, or annuity plan—

"(A) put into effect after September 1, 1942, and prior to January 1, 1945, shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) for the period beginning with the date on which it was put into effect and ending with March 15, 1945, if all provisions of the plan which are necessary to satisfy such requirements are in effect by the end of such period and have been made effective for all purposes with respect to the portion of such period after December 31, 1943;

"(M) put into effect after December 31, 1944, shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) for the period beginning with the

date on which it was put into effect and ending with the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of the employer in which the plan was put in effect, if all provisions of the plan which are necessary to satisfy such requirements are in effect by the end of such period and have been made effective for all purposes with respect to the whole of such period."

Sec. 3. If a claim for credit or refund under the internal revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war losses) for a taxable year beginning in 1941, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1945. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1945, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of such code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill H. R. 5543 is merely to give additional time for taxpayers to comply with certain provisions of the internal revenue laws. It does not in any way change the substantive provisions of existing law. It was unanimously reported by our committee and has the approval of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department. The bill is in the interest of the taxpayers. The bill makes the following extensions:

First. It extends the time to June 30, 1945, for the release of powers of appointment without incurring liability under the estate and gift tax provisions.

Second. It provides additional time for taxpayers to make amendments to employers' pension plans in order to meet the requirements of the statute. As to pension plans put into effect prior to January 1, 1945, an extension is granted up to March 15, 1945. As to employer pension plans put into effect after January 1, 1945, a continuing system is adopted allowing 2½ months after the close of the employer's taxable year.

Third. An extension of time for filing claims for credit or refund in the case of war losses sustained in 1941 is provided up to December 31, 1945. These claims would ordinarily have to be filed on or before March 15, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF TAXES BY CHECK AND MONEY ORDER

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5565) to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive certain checks and money orders in payment of taxes and for revenue stamps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 5565 is to permit the collectors of internal revenue to accept cashiers' and treasurers' checks, as well as postal, express, bank, and telegraph money orders in payment for internal-revenue stamps. Under existing law, collectors can only accept cash or certified checks in payment for internal-revenue stamps. This bill was unanimously reported and has the approval of the staff of the joint committee and the Treasury Department. It is simply for the convenience of the taxpayers in enabling them to use these checks and money orders.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3656 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to payment of taxes by check) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3656. Payment by Check and Money Orders.

"(a) Certified, cashiers', and treasurers' checks and money orders:

"(1) Authority to receive: It shall be lawful for collectors to receive for internal revenue taxes or in payment of stamps to be used in payment of internal revenue taxes certified, cashiers', and treasurers' checks drawn on National and State banks and trust companies, and United States postal, bank, express, and telegraph money orders, during such time and under such regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe.

"(2) Discharge of liability:

"(A) Check duly paid: No person who may be indebted to the United States on account of internal revenue taxes or stamps used or to be used in payment of internal revenue taxes who shall have tendered a certified, cashier's, or treasurer's check or money order as provisional payment therefor, in accordance with the terms of this subsection, shall be released from the obligation to make ultimate payment thereof until such certified, cashier's, or treasurer's check or money order so received has been duly paid.

"(B) Check unpaid: If any such check or money order so received is not duly paid the United States shall, in addition to its right to exact payment from the party originally indebted therefor, have a lien for the amount of such check upon all the assets of the bank on which drawn or for the amount of such money order upon all the assets of the issuer thereof; and such amount shall be paid out of its assets in preference to any or all other claims whatsoever against said bank or issuer except the necessary costs and expenses of administration and the reimbursement of the United States for the amount expended in the redemption of the circulating notes of such bank.

"(b) Other checks:

"(1) Authority to receive: Collectors may receive checks in addition to those specified in subsection (a) in payment of taxes other than those payable by stamp during such time and under such rules and regulations as

the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe.

"(2) Ultimate liability: If a check so received is not paid by the bank on which it is drawn the person by whom such check has been tendered shall remain liable for the payment of the tax and for all legal penalties and additions to the same extent as if such check had not been tendered."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON VERSUS HILLMAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the man who was first in peace, first in war and first in the hearts of his countrymen, when in a position to become king or dictator; when he was taken "up into an exceedingly high mountain" and shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, turned his back upon ambition, and solemnly warned our people to avoid entanglement in foreign affairs.

Under the system of government which he established, we have, in the opinion of Churchill, one of the greatest empire builders in the modern world, "in 3 or 4 years, in sober fact, become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world."

Now we are told by the Russian-born Hillman, who claims to have controlled, in the recent election, the decisive votes which will place the President in the White House for a fourth term, referring to his organization, that—

It's a good thing for America and the world at large to have a force inside the United States fighting for proper international cooperation.

Washington was the personification of honor, of honesty, of Christianity. Hillman unblushingly, on December 5 in London, told the press, knowing his statement would be broadcast throughout the world, that no one takes party platforms seriously.

Hillman not only presumes to repudiate the sound doctrine of our first and greatest President, but so sure is he of his power that, after claiming here in America the allegiance of more than a hundred of the people's representatives, he brazenly endorses falsehood, subterfuge, the repudiation of one's word and honor.

Those who, during the last campaign, assisted Hillman by money, work, or vote, now know from his own lips that he neither believes in honor or in honesty, in our form of government, in our way of life, and that, by his acceptance of the Communists and their support, he denies the existence of God, the efficacy of Christianity.

Let his supporters and his political allies cheer while other citizens hang their heads in shame.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in one a resolution and in another a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SELF-DETERMINATION BY NATIONS OF THEIR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as one Member of the House I want to commend without reservation the statement of our State Department which was carried in this morning's press to the effect that our Government stands foursquare for the right of the people of every nation in this world to choose democratically and freely their own government without interference on the part of any other power. I am glad the statement was made to apply specifically to Italy in view of a recent statement by the British Foreign Minister regarding the personnel of the Italian Cabinet. To my mind, it is entirely timely that this announcement should have been made and this position taken by our State Department. Indeed I believe such a statement of this country's position is overdue. I believe it will increase that reservoir of good will among the smaller nations of the world which our country enjoys and upon which alone we can hope to build the future peace of the world.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS' DUMBARTON OAKS STATEMENT ENTITLED TO WIDESPREAD APPROVAL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the Catholic bishops' Dumbarton Oaks statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENDING THE STATUTE OF LIMITATION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases,

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SHORT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, due to the brevity of time, we all realize that the statute of limitations, if it is to be extended, must be acted upon by tomorrow. However, in order to keep the record straight and make it absolutely clear to the Members of Congress and particularly to the American people, I want to say that our willingness to allow this Senate joint resolution to be brought up under unanimous consent should not be interpreted as giving our stamp of approval to it. If we had our way, the resolution I introduced in the House on November 28, House Joint Resolution 319, and which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, would be carried out, because it simply orders the War and Navy Departments to carry out the provisions of Public Law 339 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which we passed last June. When one cannot get a whole loaf, he must take a half loaf. With some difficulty Senate Joint Resolution 156 passed that body and though the resolution is unsatisfactory, it is better than nothing. The statute of limitations should not be allowed to expire and for this reason I do not object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, might I state that the present consideration of the resolution in no way is to be construed, following what the gentleman said, as a disposition on the part of the leadership on the majority side of opposition to the gentleman's resolution. But in view of the shortness of time it is considered wise and advisable and practical to pass the Senate resolution. It is for the purpose of preserving whatever legal rights exist under the law so that no one can claim the statute of limitations as a defense, and the Senate resolution is put through in order to insure that. It is because of the time element involved that we do so.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the majority leader has made that statement. Of course, the Army and Navy boards of investigation, in making their reports, very clearly stated that not only Admiral Kimmel and General Short but other persons likewise made grave errors, not only at Pearl Harbor but also here in the United States, though we have not yet been told who those persons are or why action has not been taken against them.

Of course, we must accept the reports of the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy that the trials cannot be held at this particular time because of security reasons. It is difficult for our lay minds to figure out just how a frank and full revelation of all the facts surrounding Pearl Harbor could now endanger our national security or seriously interfere with our war efforts. Still the Army and Navy undoubtedly have secrets that the public should not know. But some day the whole story will be told; truth cannot always be hidden from the people.

It will be remembered that the Roberts commission's report found both Kimmel and Short guilty of "dereliction of duty." The investigating committees of the War and Navy Departments, while finding Kimmel and Short made mistakes and errors, declared that "on the basis of present evidence" the facts and findings do not warrant their courts martial. Both Secretaries of War and Navy expressed their desire and intention to continue their investigations. Evidently they are not fully satisfied with the findings of their own committees. If Kimmel and Short are innocent, why not restore them to the active list? Somebody was certainly to blame for Pearl Harbor. If Kimmel and Short were not to blame, then who is to blame? The American people want to know; they are entitled to know.

Mr. Speaker, the Pearl Harbor disaster is largely if not wholly a matter to be dealt with by the Executive. The President has the authority and the responsibility to act.

However, since the Commander in Chief of our armed forces has shown little or no inclination to dispose finally of the matter it has devolved upon the Congress of the United States to take action.

On two occasions we have extended for 6 months the statute of limitations. We acted on our own initiative. We were forced to do so because the War and Navy Departments were about to permit the statutory period to expire with no action taken.

Last June the limit of legislative patience in this matter was reached. At hearings upon legislation to extend the statutory period, and to direct the War and Navy Departments to institute court-martial proceedings forthwith, representatives of those departments indicated that they were not in position to act, because they had not even commenced investigations into the matter. Imagine such a thing. No information 2½ years after Pearl Harbor. Why? As a consequence, Congress again extended the statutory period. The act also directed the Secretaries of War and Navy to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Japanese attack and to take appropriate action—to take such action as was justified by the results of these investigations.

The President signed this bill.

It was the sentiment of Congress and the country that further procrastination in regard to the Pearl Harbor incident was not in the national interest.

The fathers and mothers of those who died in Hawaii that Sunday were anxious for the truth.

The people of the Nation who have never recovered from or forgotten the dastardly attack on the flag, or the terrible damage to the fleet, were anxious for the truth.

There was, and is, a strong conviction among our people, regardless of party, that the two officers who have borne for this long period the stigma of Pearl Harbor should have their day in court.

These, in brief, were the considerations that prompted the legislation of last June with its positive direction to the

War and Navy Departments to investigate and to take appropriate action.

What has been the intervening history? The War and Navy Departments ordered and conducted through duly constituted tribunals independent investigations.

Naturally, any Army board of investigation or Navy court of inquiry would be reluctant to issue any report critical of its Commander in Chief—especially in time of war.

Nevertheless, the officers who presided were of the highest rank and must have possessed character and intelligence.

Their hearings were lengthy. Both the Army board and the Navy court journeyed to the scene of the disaster.

Over a month ago they submitted their reports and recommendations to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Then silence followed—a silence explained by the alleged necessity of studying the reports or classifying them.

At this time, Congress has a right to expect from the War and Navy Departments a clear-cut explanation of the results of these investigations and an official statement of their position with regard to the necessity of further congressional action.

We ought not to have to act blindly and in the dark.

We gave these Departments a directive to take appropriate action by December 7, 1944, on the basis of their investigations.

There can be no further excuse offered that the War and Navy Departments do not have the facts.

They owe it to Congress and to the country to make clear before the expiration of the present extension on December 7 what their investigations show the facts to be, and what action they have taken or propose to take against any individuals as a result of those investigations.

They cannot expect Congress, from whom these facts have thus far been withheld, to bear the brunt of public indignation over more delays and mystery in this matter.

If these investigations have cleared Admiral Kimmel and General Short, then fair play to those officers and the American people requires a clear official statement to that effect.

If these investigations have indicated that other individuals, and not Kimmel and Short, were responsible for Pearl Harbor, then the American people have a right to know who these individuals are and what action is to be taken against them.

Kimmel and Short have been publicly disgraced. They have paid for that fatal day with the wreckage of their careers. But they have never been tried and convicted. For 3 years they have been denied the right of every American to a public hearing and a verdict as to whether they are guilty or innocent.

The suggestion has been made that the American people are more interested in winning the war than in knowing the truth of Pearl Harbor. This argument is advanced in favor of further mystery and

delay. There is no logic in such a position.

There is no reason to believe that our people lack the capacity to win the war and face the truth about a 3-year-old tragedy.

We can win the war without violating the decencies of our civilization. We can win the war and not keep men condemned without a hearing. We can win the war and not shelter guilt or delay the exoneration of the guiltless. We can win the war and not compromise our national honor by sacrificing the honor of innocent men. We can win the war without keeping a perpetual skeleton in the closet. We can win the war without jeopardizing our ability to win future wars by planting in the hearts of our present and future Army and Navy officers the fear that they have no way in America to protect and defend their good names.

We of this Congress, the Secretaries of War and the Navy reckon ill if we count out the historian of tomorrow. No man should dare act on the premise that we can delay revelations about Pearl Harbor until Kimmel and Short die, and the truth perishes with them. Unfortunately, Frank Knox is now dead. Others, too, will die. History will record the truth for tomorrow, even though the relentless search has to ferret out many dark and buried secrets. The story of the tragedy of Pearl Harbor is bound to be fully told. Future generations will scorn and despise those who tried to suppress it.

This Congress may grant any further extension of time the War and Navy Departments in good faith need and request.

But this Congress should not condone any failure by them to reveal the facts their investigations have recorded and to indicate the action they propose to take.

We have directed them to act.

We have expected them to act.

Before we proceed further on our own course we should have the benefit of the facts they have available and enlightenment as to their proposed course of action.

If the rumors current throughout the country can be given even the slightest credence the responsibility for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor will be found to rest on shoulders other than those of Kimmel and Short. This matter has already assumed the proportions of the Dreyfus case in France. We cannot afford to have such a stain on the reputation of Congress. The failure to act is not the fault of Congress. We cannot, we must not, we will not make a farce of this great tragedy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] whether the resolution carries the second paragraph that was carried in the former resolution, with reference to the Department continuing an investigation. I may say that the Navy Department is very anxious that the language be contained in the resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy, in accordance with the

statement he made, to continue to make an investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the resolution extends the existing law in toto.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Has the gentleman any objection to the resolution being amended by this language:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to continue their investigations into the facts surrounding the catastrophe described in section 1 above, and to commence such proceedings against such persons as the facts may justify.

Mr. Speaker, I may state that the Secretary of the Navy asked me today to present this matter to the House, because they want that language in whatever resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that there has been plenty of investigation and that what the people want are some facts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the statement of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, that they are continuing an investigation, we should at least concur in their desire to do so by authorizing them to do it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with that, but I think the people want some information.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I also think so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that, in my opinion, the present resolution extends what is contained in the resolutions we have previously passed.

Mr. SHORT. That is, it extends the time for 6 months, in addition to the two previous extensions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the language as contained in the previous resolution is extended by this resolution.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection and interpose no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is the intent to extend the present law which the Congress has heretofore passed in the nature of resolutions, and on which we have acted upon in the past.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, that clears it up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, or crime or offense against the United States, that operate to prevent the court martial, prosecution, trial, or punishment of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe

of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, or crime or offense against the United States, are hereby extended for a further period of 6 months, in addition to the extensions provided for in Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress, and Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5587, Rept. No. 2023) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5587) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I would ask the gentleman from New York if he is prepared to proceed without an agreement as to time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. I think we might better fix the time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5587, the first supplemental appropriation bill, 1945, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we submit herewith the last appropriation bill of the session. It comprises all of the undisposed-of items which it is necessary to handle before the expiration of the session and the Congress.

The estimates as submitted to the committee amounted to \$587,049,607.12.

We recommend to the Congress provision for \$478,524,712.12, in appropriations, in reappropriations, and in contract authority. In other words we recommend a decrease of \$161,000,000 in the estimates, a saving of about 28 percent.

This bill is made necessary largely by acts of Congress which were enacted subsequent to the passage of the annual appropriation acts. For example, the Penalty Mail Act, under which departments were required to pay postage on outgoing mail, and section 213 of the independent offices appropriation bill, discontinuing agencies of the Government which have been in operation for longer than 1 year without direct appropriations or other authorization from Congress.

The largest part of the bill is, of course, for the Naval Establishment, which takes up 59 percent of the entire amount which we are recommending and which is largely a liquidation of public works contracts entered into under contractual authority. We have today the largest and most powerful Navy in the world, and its maintenance is naturally a matter of correspondingly increased expenditure.

Another item on which a good deal of interest has been evinced is the collection of statistics needed for reconversion. Under the bill provision is made for the collection of statistics we expect to be needed for the post-war and reconversion period.

National housing and community facilities recommendations submitted by the Bureau of the Budget have been reduced. The Budget recommended \$20,000,000; the committee submits a proposal for \$10,000,000. Fifteen million was estimated for community facilities and the committee recommends a reduction to seven and one-half million.

Another item which received as much attention as any in the bill, so far as testimony presented before the committee was concerned, was the item for the supply and distribution of farm labor. The testimony before the committee indicated that the system now in operation has worked with such efficiency that there is widespread demand for its continuation; and the committee recommends, in excess of the Budget estimates, that the date of expiration be extended from June 30, the end of the fiscal year, to December 31, the end of the calendar year, in order to permit full seasonal contracts; and also recommends \$10,000,000 additional contractual authority to insure prompt provision for foreign labor needed in the agricultural sections where local labor is insufficient to supply the demands for wartime production.

Mr. Chairman, as this bill concludes the appropriation program for the session, it may be fitting at this point briefly to review the work of the committee for the session, the Congress, and the two war Congresses.

In the last two Congresses the Committee on Appropriations has handled more business, been in more continuous sessions, and disposed of more work than any Committee on Appropriations in the history of the Congress in any like period.

of time. We have reported out more money and more appropriation bills than any previous committee of this or any other country in the history of the world.

We have reported out—and I should like to emphasize this point—a more drastic reduction, both in amounts and by percentages, in nonwar appropriations than any previous committee. And we have devoted more time, more work, more detailed and painstaking research into the budgetary needs of the Government than any previous committee.

These are not idle statements. The work of the committee has not been done in a corner. The record speaks for itself. It is written in documents that all may read. A complete record is found in the printed hearings and in the debate on the floor as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is available to all. At the most critical time in the history of the Nation, the committee has met every emergency and supplied every need effectively, efficiently, and expeditiously. No department of the Government has found occasion for complaint. In one of the most searching political campaigns ever conducted, there has been no criticism, either direct or implied, of the work of the Appropriations Committee. It has done its work to the entire satisfaction not only of the press and the Congress, but of every governmental agency.

The highest officers of the Army and Navy—and their testimony is in the printed hearings—have said that the committee has done everything that could be done in the prosecution of the war and in supporting the war program. Representatives of the War Department and Navy Department assured the committee that there was nothing that they could suggest which the committee might do which had not been done.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when it is the vogue to criticize congressional procedure, when there is frequent insistence that the procedure of the House is inadequate, antiquated, and inefficient, we submit, in answer to that criticism, the record of the Committee on Appropriations through this critical period, in which the committee has supplied every fiscal need, in which it has met every budgetary emergency, to the complete satisfaction of every branch of every editorial and administrative agency which might be in position to bring legitimate criticism to bear.

Likewise, the committee has introduced, as it has been continuously introducing since its establishment, various administrative improvements.

One of the principle criticisms, made in the resolutions now pending before the Committee on Rules, to renovate, recondition, and regenerate the House, is that we do not have the machinery to provide the committees and the Members of the House with sufficient data and information and that the Committee on Appropriations in particular is without means of securing information other than that supplied by the agencies seeking appropriations.

Such statements ignore the system of investigation which has been in use by the Committee on Appropriations during

the entire session and under which we have investigated every mooted point which has come before us, and under which we have secured all the information that any member of the committee or any Member of the House might desire. Invariably these resolutions which come before the Committee on Rules provide for the establishment of some permanent agency, usually a joint agency of the House and the Senate, which will secure information for the Members of the House which they are not at present able to get.

May we earnestly invite anyone interested in any such proposition to investigate the method used by the Committee on Appropriations. Under our method we draw from any department of the Government the best men they have.

We use them as long as they are required, at the same salary which they are now receiving in the departments, and when their work is done, we return them.

Let me call attention to the advantage of this system over the establishment of any permanent agency in the House or elsewhere.

We have, for example, 10 subcommittees in the Committee on Appropriations. If all 10 subcommittees happen to desire to conduct an investigation simultaneously, this elastic system provides the men to make the investigation for all 10 of them. If only 1 committee desires to conduct an investigation, the men who are not needed return to their work. We use them only as long as they are needed, and we use only the number needed. If you had a permanent agency, either one of two things would be constantly in effect; either you would have men sitting around doing nothing a very large part of the time at Government expense when investigations were slack or you would not have enough men to meet the peak needs when investigations were in demand. Under this system we have at any time all the men needed to meet any emergency, and under this system we have only the men needed when investigations are necessary; or, if there are no investigations, we have none at all. That one thing alone would condemn the establishment of a permanent agency.

There are numerous other decisive advantages, but I will mention only one more. A second advantage over a permanent establishment here in the House or anywhere else is that we provide exactly the character of men and the qualification needed for the occasion. No two of these investigations are exactly alike. Each one has its individual phase. Some of them need an accountant, some need an auditor, some a detective, some a chemist, and some a lawyer. This system provides exactly the character of operative needed.

They can produce at any time a lawyer or a physician or a chemist or an accountant, where any permanent system could not provide always the wide range of qualifications needed for specific investigations. That in itself would be sufficient to condemn any permanent establishment.

May I mention just one more, of many others. That is the matter of economy. This committee was given \$100,000, which is a very small amount compared to what has been given other investigating committees. As much as \$500,000 have been spent on congressional investigations, and nothing practical to show for it. But this committee had only \$100,000, and spent only a little more than half of that, and we have secured all data any member of the committee or Member of the House indicated his desire to have. It has been done efficiently and it has been done economically. We call the proper operative from the department, we put him on the job, a new face, a new man, a new enthusiasm, and when the job is done we send him back. If you had a permanent establishment you would have the same old fellows on there growing old and careless and inefficient, and becoming so familiar with the people in the departments and through long association reaching such terms of camaraderie with them that you could not hope to get the results to be secured by a new operative on each new investigation.

If you will but examine the system which has been in effect in our committee for a year and which has answered every need, you will understand how we have been able to save so much money this session. None of the proponents of the proposition before the Committee on Rules seems to have taken that trouble.

Incidentally, the House now has at hand every agency needed for the improvement of any procedure which may not be adapted to our needs. Numerous changes have been made in the rules from year to year over the last century. All have been made through the agency of the Committee on Rules. Anyone who wants to make a change has but to introduce a resolution. The Committee on Rules, which has shown its capacity and ability and readiness to meet every requirement for changes in procedure, is authorized to meet the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from Missouri is saying about changes in the rules of the House. I do not believe I have ever heard a man advocate a wholesale reorganization of the rules of the House whom I have ever known to argue successfully a sharply contested point of order. It seems to me that before they undertake to revolutionize the rules of the House they had better learn what the rules are and how they are applied.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But to show the need for this proposition invariably the great point that was emphasized in all of these propositions to revise the procedure is that they want information; that they cannot get information. Gentlemen, what information do they want? Have any of those men ever mentioned any information that they wanted that they could not get? No, nobody has done so. Why, on my committee there was one man who kept filling the newspapers continually with

complaints that we ought to have some sort of agency that would give us information. When his attention was called to the fact that although we had the most efficient system of investigating that has ever been devised and that never at any time had he applied to it for information or made any attempt to use it, he said, "You know, it goes well in the newspapers up in my district." Nobody in this House, even a Member who is not on the Committee on Appropriations, who may want information pertaining to appropriations or the departments for which the appropriations are provided, but what can get it immediately. We can get it economically. We can get it from men who are the highest trained men in the world. We can call to our committee men trained by the Treasury Department, men trained by the Department of Justice, men trained by the F. B. I., men trained by the Secret Service, than whom there are no better qualified investigators upon the face of the earth.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, my contention is that Congress saw fit to include in the Budget and Accounting Act an authorization for a Congressional Investigation Division, under the Comptroller General. It is in the law and an appropriation for that purpose is not subject to a point of order. I contend that if you set up that investigation division under the Comptroller General, who is answerable solely to Congress and not to the executive branch of the Government, and give him sufficient funds for a permanent organization, that the results of the investigations which he will make independently and at the request of every committee of Congress will save hundreds of millions of dollars and also do away with your special committees, including the one that the gentleman has in his committee and the one in the Senate under the Senate Appropriations Committee. In fact, the amount appropriated for both of those committees would be about one-half of what the Comptroller General said would be necessary at the outset to set up an efficient agency to make investigations for the Congress, and to enable him to go forward.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What investigation does the gentleman want made?

Mr. COCHRAN. Any investigation that any committee of Congress thinks should be made, including the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What inquiry would the gentleman suggest? What information is it that we do not have now?

Mr. COCHRAN. I would investigate to determine whether there is waste and extravagance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are investigating that right now.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the Senate proceedings, the names of dozens of employees of the executive branch of the Government that are working in Senate offices. Let me say to the gentleman if those employees can be spared by the executive branch of the Government

so that they spend all their time in the offices of committees and in the offices of Senators, then they do not need those employees in the executive branch of the Government and the appropriation should be taken away from them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, the House is not going to investigate the affairs of the Senate, whether the investigating authority is lodged in a permanent agency or in a system such as is employed by the Committee on Appropriations. Intercameral comity would not permit it. So far as the particular agency to which my colleague refers is concerned, the Committee on Appropriations under its authority can call any man from the establishment indicated, if we need him.

It should be added that the Committee on Appropriations has had at all times the warmest cooperation with all the departments. It not infrequently happens that the report of our investigators makes even a stronger case for a department and its activity than the representatives of the department themselves have made in their presentation of their estimates. And at times charges of prodigality against a Government agency, when investigated by our operatives, have proven wholly without foundation.

The system has proven satisfactory to all concerned and especially to the members of the committee desiring to check information supplied by the departments or to secure new information not directly available. If there is any information that the gentleman wants, all that is necessary is for him to indicate it.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I want any information I will get it, and if I cannot get it I do not belong here.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then why spend the enormous amount of money proposed in these resolutions establishing permanent agencies when they are not needed? I must concede that there is one defect in the system used by the Committee on Appropriations. There is one very serious objection to it, and that is that it does not cost enough money. We seem to have got the idea that we have to spend a half million dollars on an investigation before the data are worth anything. Ours is sadly economical. We get the best men in the world. You cannot get better-trained men than we get, and you cannot get them at a smaller salary than that for which we get them, because we get them at the civil-service rating.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately, I did not hear the preliminary statement of the gentleman, but do I understand that the gentleman would not look with favor upon various congressional standing committees having a proper and adequate staff?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, no. I heartily approve of that. The Committee on Appropriations has just such a situation.

I rather think the gentleman from Mississippi and I are in exact agreement

upon the necessity of the committee being adequately staffed.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says we are in accord, and I hope we are.

Do I understand he believes that the committee should pick up a man here and there temporarily as it needed his services?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would depend entirely on the purpose for which the man was needed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going to give anybody expert assistance it ought to be the individual Member of the House, because there are so many questions he needs to explore. I believe I can say without boasting that there is probably no man in this House who attempts to dig up more facts and statistics and details than I do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I call on the experts. When I want information on rivers and harbors or anything touching their work, I call on the best experts the world has ever seen, the expert engineers in the Corps of Army Engineers.

When I want information on veterans' affairs, I call upon the veterans' organizations or the Veterans' Administration and get that information.

When I want information on power rates, I call the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Administration, or the Rural Electrification Administration, and I get that information.

But when you park these experts on staffs of the various committees, you take from members not on the particular committee the expert serves the opportunity of getting the information they need.

I say if you are going to give anybody any assistance at all you ought to give the individual Member an employee who will aid him in helping to contact these various experts that are already on the pay roll and who are able and willing to dig up the information needed. I think that would be far better than to build up, as the gentleman says, a bureaucracy around the various committees of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, few Members of the House in their service have rendered a more valuable service to the country than has the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It will be remembered that 17 years ago the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and I were called upon to investigate the Cotton Exchange. That was a big order. We did that in connection with a Senate committee. We got the experts we needed, we investigated what was going on, we exposed the whole situation and cleaned it up. If we had had a committee with a corps of experts around it the chances are they would not have known a thing in the world about the particular subject with which we had to deal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say that in addition to the many reliable and

accurate sources of information to which the gentleman refers, and to which he has had access, there is also available to any Member of the House who desires to avail himself of it, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It is one of the most efficient branches of the Government service and one of the best of its kind in the world. Any Member can call them at any time and will find them at his service.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete accord with the compliment paid my distinguished colleague from Mississippi and his ability to get information. The thing I am objecting to is the necessity of relying upon the departments, the bureaucracies, or whatever you want to call them, in order to get information. In my opinion, the Congress should be able to get that information and get all of it independently of the various bureaus.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is exactly what the Committee on Appropriations is doing at this time.

Mr. COLMER. I think I can go along, too, with the suggestion that if we can get the proper type and quality of assistants, an additional clerk for each Member would be an improvement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will see that we are provided with the requisite legislative authority we will see that he gets that too.

While we are on the subject I may say that I noticed the other day where a columnist suggested that the chairmen of all the legislative committees be made members of the Committee on Appropriations. We have no objection to that. We need all the help we can get. The Committee on Appropriations has worked unreasonably long hours during the war. And it has worked its clerks to the point of exhaustion. The work has been so burdensome that we are now seriously considering restricting each member to one bill, instead of putting him on two subcommittees as heretofore, in order to give him an opportunity to spend more time on the floor of the House and also time to attend to his own office work. The subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations have been in such continuous session that we have had little time for anything else and our office work has suffered accordingly. I do not know how much work the legislative committees have, but if they work like we do—and I take for granted they have been under the same compulsion during the war—they would be supermen indeed if they could find time to take care of their own duties, and in addition handle the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

In the same paper another columnist suggested that due to the operation of the rule of seniority all of the chairmen of committees have reached an age where they are so decrepit and senile as not to be in position to render service on any committee. Certainly there is incongruous inconsistency somewhere.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. May I submit this query? The gentleman will remember that the legislative committees some twenty-odd years ago had jurisdiction over appropriations. We have taken that power away from them and given it to the Committee on Appropriations, which committee we have increased from time to time. May I ask the gentleman, knowing that he is thoroughly familiar with the workings of the committees and of the House, whether perhaps it would not be better if we would go back to the old system and let the legislative committees have some work and relieve the Committee on Appropriations of the tremendous work and responsibility involved; to again place the work and the responsibility of appropriations on the legislative committees, who invariably should be informed as to the need of the appropriations, because originally they have before them the evidence on which these appropriations that are asked for have been obtained by them? What is the gentleman's opinion about that? Would that not relieve that great Committee on Appropriations by giving back to those six or eight major committees jurisdiction over appropriations, with the same power that they possessed before?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In answer to that, may I say to the gentleman that if he advocates the dissolution of the Committee on Appropriations, I would have no objection. I would be a good deal better off personally if that were done. But the time to which he refers was when the appropriations of this Congress ran some three hundred or four hundred million dollars a year. They now run, in round figures, \$70,000,000,000 a year—an entirely different proposition. At that time departmental estimates were comparatively simple. Departmental estimates have mushroomed and pyramided and skyrocketed and now include every conceivable activity.

Furthermore, we have adopted the Budget system of which the concentration of appropriations in one committee is an essential part.

Mr. SABATH. In that connection, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. SABATH. Speaking of what the appropriations were years ago and what they are now, I thoroughly realize and appreciate the great difference, because when I came here the cost to run the Government was about \$1,000,000,000. Now it costs more than \$1,000,000,000 to run one department; for instance, the Department of Agriculture, for which we are obliged to appropriate over \$1,000,000,000 more than we expended and appropriated for the entire country when I first came to the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. We have in the last 4 years appropriated more money for one department than was previously reported to

run the entire governmental establishments. And in that connection I would like to call attention to another administrative measure adopted by the committee.

Another innovation which the committee has adopted is the standardization of the qualifications of its staff—to which reference has just been made. At the time to which the gentleman from Illinois refers, when appropriations were small and departmental budgets comparatively simple, you could go out into the chairman's district and pick up a man almost anywhere who would help get votes for the chairman in the next election, and he would come up here and do a very good job. But with the increasing size and complexity of the annual budgets the work requires highly trained men with long experience in key positions in State, Federal, or municipal work of this nature.

When a chairman puts a member on our staff he stays there permanently. Every man appointed is kept by the succeeding chairman, regardless of his party affiliation—and unfortunately in some rare instances—whether he fits into the particular position or not. So in order to insure the selection of competent men for these exacting positions, the committee has adopted certain preliminary minimum requirements as to training, previous service, capacity, and qualification. I have voluntarily relinquished my prerogative of appointing members of the staff and have placed it in a committee consisting of the three ranking majority members and the two ranking minority members of the committee. An appointee must first conform to the specified preliminary requirements, and then must be screened by this committee of the oldest and most experienced members of the committee.

I regret to say that the problems of a permanent staff for the committee has come to an unwelcome crisis with the close of this Congress. A man who has served the committee for 36 years, who came here as a boy, appointed by one of the great chairmen in the history of the committee, Chairman Tawney, of Minnesota, Marc Sheild of Minnesota, has tendered his resignation, and in spite of every inducement we can offer him he adheres to that decision. Marc Sheild came to the service of the committee in 1908. I think probably one of the most fortunate days in the history of this House was the day that Chairman Tawney brought Marc Sheild to Washington. That feeling is shared by all members of the committee and the hundreds of men who have served on the committee in the last 36 years. Judge John J. Fitzgerald, of New York, one of the ablest men who ever sat in the American Congress, who served here for 20 years, one of the noted parliamentarians of his time and one of the leaders of the House in his day, made the statement that perhaps the most valuable service he performed while a Member of the House was the appointment of Marc Sheild as clerk of the committee, and there is general agreement that he was justified in making that statement.

In 1938, when Marc was completing his first 30 years of service, some notice was taken of the occasion here in this Hall. As a member of the committee, I felt justified in saying:

One of the most efficient members of the staff of the House, one of the ablest, one of the most indefatigable, who has served in that capacity in its history, is the Clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Marcellus C. Sheild.

And I added, with what today seems almost childish innocence:

During his service the Government has spent more money than has ever been spent by the United States, or any other nation on earth, in a similar period of time, sums so stupendous as to stagger human comprehension.

Mr. Chairman, all notions of Government spending have gone by the board since those peaceful days. The United States has prepared for war; it has been at war for 3 long years. Congress has appropriated and the Government has spent in the last 6½ years nearly twice as much money as in the first century and a half of the Republic. And Marc Sheild has handled this tremendous increase, with all its staggering responsibility, with the same serene untroubled efficiency that marked his earlier years. The country has been fortunate in having at this vital post during these years of unparalleled activity a man so eminently qualified for that arduous task.

Mr. Sheild is a man of rare ability. I think at this time, and I make the statement advisedly, he has rendered greater service in the budgetary service of the Government than any man, either in the House or out of it today. His ability, his calm poise, his rare judgment, his indefatigable industry have been invaluable to the House, and especially in these latter years when the work of the Committee on Appropriations has grown so rapidly under the impetus of war. In George Eliot's book, *Romola*, Romola's son asked her, speaking of Savonarola, "How can a man be both great and happy?" and Romola answered, "Fra Giralamo has the greatness of integrity." Marc Sheild has the greatness of integrity. In all the years he has been here, occupying a key position and in intimate touch with the budget officer of every department—in a position to exercise an influence such as nobody else could exercise here, on the Hill—never has he used his position, that great influence, for any personal interest. For neither himself nor his friends has he ever taken advantage of his position to secure place or preferment for anyone. Never has he exerted that influence to mold legislation or affect appropriations. It is easy to understand what pressure is brought to bear upon him here to secure a position for someone, to increase an appropriation for someone, to change the phraseology of a bill for someone. Never yet, in any instance, has Marc Sheild deviated from his adherence to the one principle that has guided him in the 36 years he has been here—the good of the country and the integrity of our legislative processes.

We have done anything we could to keep Marc Sheild with us. We need him.

We regret to see him go. But he promised himself, long ago, and he promised Mrs. Sheild that at this anniversary he would retire. He has other work which he wants to do. He has books to write, and I will say that any book he may write would be of such a character that no library in the country would be complete without it.

While I deplore his going, I congratulate him on his adherence to his plans.

It was the custom in ancient Rome that when a young man reached his majority, a great ceremony was held. With pomp and circumstance a toga was conferred upon him as evidence of his Roman citizenship. In that book which has been so much in the public eye in the last 2 years, *The Robe*, there is a reference to this ancient custom and a suggestion by a character in the book that there should be another occasion; that when a man had reached the zenith of his power, the apex of his achievements, when he had rendered greatest service to the Republic and was at the height of his acclaim by the people of the Republic, another ceremony should be held in which he would resign his toga and walk forth to return at last to that place from which he came. Marc Sheild is at the apex of his career. He is in the prime of life. He is in perfect health. He leaves at a time when there is yet much before him—while the sun is still high—while the evil days come not, nor years when we shall say "I have no pleasure in them." But he would not go if he were not certain there was someone to take his place. Working with him, closely associated with him all these years, Mr. John Pugh is as well prepared to take over this important work as a man could possibly be. We will miss Marc. But his work will go on as he has planned it. I commend to the House as the new clerk of the committee, John C. Pugh, in every way qualified by character and ability and long and distinguished service both in the departments and in the committee to follow his great and lovable predecessor in the arduous duties of this exacting position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman he has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield in accordance with the schedule which has been submitted to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, our learned fathers, in drafting the Constitution, vested original jurisdiction over revenue and appropriation measures in the House of Representatives.

The control of the purse carries with it the control of Government, and that responsibility, thus vested in us, makes us individually and collectively the directors of the greatest Government in the world, and I shall go further and say the greatest Government of all time.

Like the largest private businesses, though many times magnified in volume

and scope, it is essential that we have executive assistants to direct and handle the multiplicity of details inherent in the tasks we must perform.

Despite criticisms to the contrary, the Congress functions with speed and efficiency, having in mind its yearly overall legislative program. I will say that, in my judgment, it has been performed remarkably well, and that much of whatever credit may be due must be shared with the loyal and faithful and diligent public servants who have so ably aided us and counseled us in the formative stages of the legislation which we have enacted.

Marcellus C. Sheild stands to the fore of those loyal men, who, today and in days gone by, have facilitated our work and made practicable its performance.

I have known Marc Sheild personally and well throughout my congressional service. I am proud to call him my friend and to have his friendship. He is a man of very marked ability and possessed of ideal traits and faculties rarely found in a single individual.

His contribution of his great talents and energies to the Congress and to the Nation during his long period of service on the Committee on Appropriations is immeasurable and has been of inestimable value, and there is a debt of gratitude owing to him which I fear never can be adequately paid.

Occupying a key position as he has and does today, a position little known to the general public but a position well known to every Member of the House, everyone who has served in either branch of the Congress, and to everyone who has ever appeared before the Appropriations Committee, in his position he wielded a great influence on the legislative affairs of our country, an influence of which we are aware, we Members, and which we appreciate, and in his case an influence which has always been constructive, actuated by the high ideals that he possesses and actuated by a loyalty to the committee with which he has been associated for many years, and a deep feeling of love and patriotism for his country.

His retirement, which he has so fully earned, will mean a severe loss to each of us and to the people that we serve. I am particularly pleased, however, to hear the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that Marc Sheild intends to utilize his future time in part at least in writing. I know his great knowledge and experience reduced to writing will make a definite contribution to the knowledge of the people of America as to the workings of the Congress of the United States and as to the workings and efficiency of the great and powerful Committee on Appropriations.

His great knowledge will be missed in this body; his gracious and magnetic personality will leave a vacant space hard to fill.

I wish to record my personal regrets at his retirement and to take this opportunity to extend to "Marc," as I like to call him, my heartiest good wishes for himself and for his family in the years that lie ahead and my sincere best wishes

for every happiness and every success which he has so fully earned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to join in this tribute to a faithful, honest, conscientious employee. In more than 37 years, Marc Sheild has worked faithfully and efficiently for our Government. Never a partisan, his efforts were directed to the single purpose of serving faithfully his country. His experience and sound advice have been helpful in determining our fiscal policies. He has helped the Appropriations Committee in its efforts to bring about sanity in our spending.

It is unfortunate in this hour, when so many demands are made upon the public Treasury, in a period when we need expert knowledge of our departments, we should be deprived of his services. We can ill afford his loss. Marc Sheild leaves us with a full appreciation on our part of the fine work he has accomplished for his country. He leaves us all wishing him many years of happiness and prosperity in the rest period he has so richly earned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, for more than a generation Marc Sheild has been an institution around the Capitol of the United States. He has applied himself diligently to learning the facts about the Government of the United States and the Government's business, and I think it may be truthfully and fairly said that he knows more about the Government of the United States and its business than any other man. In addition to that, he is a skillful legislative draftsman, the kind of a fellow who when a bill is in preparation will spend nights and Sundays working it out, the kind of service that it is necessary for a committee of this House carrying the burden that the Appropriations Committee does, to have.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be hard for us to lose him at this time. I regret to see him go at a time when we are approaching perhaps the end of the war and are going to be obliged to cut down expenses and to recover into the Treasury enormous sums of money. However, we are fortunate at the present time that we have one of the capacity and ability of John Pugh to take his place. John is especially fortunate in coming to the position of principal clerk because he has had charge of the Army and the Navy bills and he will know the spots where we will have to move when it is time for us to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee perhaps longer than anyone else at this time and it is a privilege for me to have spent 22 years working with Marc Sheild and to pay this slight tribute to the work he has done for the United States of America.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, Marc Sheild is unusually lucky; in fact, more fortunate than the Members of Congress in many ways. Right now particularly he is privileged to sit in an obscure place on the floor and hear the nice things said about him. Usually we Members do not hear those things; they happen after we have shuffled off; they are printed in the Record. But I very heartily join in the things that have been said about Marc Sheild, complimentary perhaps, but not one bit exaggerated.

I think I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations 14 or 16 years. Someone said that every great institution is measured by the length and shadow of a man. The work that the Committee on Appropriations has performed over these years covers an interesting period, because there was a feeling back in the twenties, or maybe it was in the early thirties, that we would have some economy in government. You may remember that period away back in the early history of time. The Committee on Appropriations received the brunt of that. Then came the other period, and the pendulum swung to the other extreme due to the emergency, when we had to come in and appropriate a colossal, stupendous sum of money on the faith almost alone of the departmental heads.

Marc Sheild has been the calm, deliberate, well balanced, and industrious influence that has quietly moved right along through that scene. When those on the committee would get wrought up and emotional, on this side or that side, after the storm and flurry were over usually Marc Sheild would move in.

In addition to what has been said about him I want to make this comment about his very interesting personality and very remarkable character. I think he has perhaps the most judicious temperament of any person that I have ever been closely connected with for he can come nearer seeing a situation move to and fro, and he can come nearer hitting a true balance on the facts and on the law and on what ought to be done. You must remember that the work of the Committee on Appropriations is not just a question of going in there with a chop ax and seeing where you can chop off a few thousand or a few million dollars. There is definitely another side to that operation. The other side is that you have to provide adequately for the institutions of government. It is very easy to take a bill with a few billion dollars in it and say, "Oh, well, that is too much money; cut a billion dollars off of that; that is enough to give them." But are you giving that important war activity the money it ought to have? What is going to be the effect of this indiscriminate use of the chop ax? In a dilemma of that kind you could turn to Marc Sheild. He would turn to the pages of the hearings or turn to this testimony or to that information, and his advice would be safe and conservative and helpful.

We are in somewhat of a crisis, not only in the Committee on Appropriations but

in the whole legislative establishment. Maybe it is not inopportune to take just a minute to say something about that. We sit on the committees of the Congress. We pass on important legislative matters involving not only billions of dollars in funds but staggering proposals in a legislative way.

We sit across the table from departments, agencies, and organizations that have brought to their side as advisers and counselors and assistants the very finest talent that American dollars can buy, yet we do not have the courage to provide ourselves individually in our offices and on committees with the kind of talent we should have.

We have been fortunate on this Committee on Appropriations and on many other committees as well that men like Marc Sheild and John Pugh have stayed there through the years, at salaries much less than they could have received in many places in private industry or even in other Government agencies.

We set up an investigating committee of some kind in the House to go out on some investigating scheme, and they can employ a general counsel or they can employ all sorts of analysts, historical researchers, and what have you, and the sky is the limit on what they are paid, but when it comes down to the important, man-killing work our regular committees have to do, we seem to be parsimonious about it.

I talked to a Member of Congress a few moments ago; I had lunch with him. He looked all worn out. He said, "I was in my office last night dictating until 12 o'clock. I have a secretary and two clerks, and still I cannot answer all the mail from my constituents." Yet we haggle here about it; we hesitate about it.

The people of this country who pay the tax bill are not so unreasonable as to demand that Members of Congress and the committees of Congress understaff themselves because perhaps some person is going to make some criticism of them.

One of the first times I took the floor of this House after becoming a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, back during the days when our Republican friends were in power and Mr. Will Wood, of Indiana, was chairman of the committee, I devoted most of the time that I spoke on the independent offices appropriation bill to commenting upon the fact that the Appropriations Committee of the House ought to have an independent staff of clerical and investigation men who could take the appropriation requests and carefully analyze them, men who would grow up with them from year to year, who could advise the committee and advise the clerks and advise the chairman, sit by their side when we were in court, so to speak, hearing these estimates. But we have never done anything about it. We have now a system of investigation that is working very well, but much more can be done along that line.

Coming back to the point—I do not want to detain the Committee—we are suffering a great loss in Marc Sheild's leaving us. But Marc is not retiring, like

a man who packs up his tools and goes up to his nook in the mountains to sit by the stream. Marc will be a busy man. He is leaving an active life on the Hill, we are happy to say, in strong, vigorous health. Knowing him as I know him, knowing what he has as I know what he possesses, knowing the need for it as I know it to be, I venture the suggestion that perhaps Marc is not retiring as much as he thinks he is going to retire, because there is so much need for him at this critical hour, so much need for the vast store of information he has, for the great assistance he could be to people who badly need him. He is such a fine, sincere, earnest fellow that I think those things are going to mean that he is still going to be a busy man. But we will miss him. We are fortunate to have following in his footsteps John Pugh. You do not see them and you do not hear them making a speech in the well of the House, and you do not see interviews with them in the newspapers, but when Congress takes a recess for Christmas or Thanksgiving or in the summer, these boys are down in the committee room plugging away, day and night, Sundays and holidays and every other time. So I think it is fine to stop a little today to pay tribute to the fellows who do the real work, the men behind the scenes who carry this great burden.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, Marc Sheild is today the most remarkable man in the service of our Government. I will go further and say that he is one of the remarkable men of this century. He knows more about the workings of the United States Government at home and around the earth than any other man alive. He has what I would call a photographic mind. A set of facts makes an impress on his mental equipment that never fades. Years may elapse before he wishes to recall that set of facts, but when he does, lo and behold, the lens is right before him. Knowledge of itself does not make a perfect clerk of the Appropriations Committee but knowledge combined with wisdom does. Mr. Sheild possesses this combination of knowledge and wisdom in a super-superalative degree.

When Mr. Sheild entered the world 60 years ago come next April 13, there was no seer with enough prognosticating ability to prophesy the heights to which he would arise in the service of our country. His father was a railroad man and Marc was born on "the other side" of the railroad tracks. Thus it was demonstrated again, as it so often has been demonstrated in this land of opportunity under the American flag, how genius may flower and bloom from the most unpropitious beginnings. He was determined to get an education and to secure money for that purpose he spent the summer of 1904 pushing a chair at the St. Louis Exposition. He was struggling along at the University of Minnesota when James A. Tawney, the outstanding citizen of Winona, then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, attracted by his pluck and sterling qualities, offered

him a subordinate clerkship under his committee at Washington. Tawney knew what sort of appraisalment to put on pluck in the human values. He himself had risen from the humble calling of a blacksmith to become one of the leaders of the House of Representatives and a power on the Republican side. A big man with a booming voice, he never failed to attract attention when he spoke and he was a member of the little coterie that ran the House in his day.

Marc was a New Year's gift to the Nation. He began his service as assistant clerk of the Appropriations Committee on January 1, 1908. I am one of the few living antediluvians in these parts who were here when Marc came to Washington. I had then been for more than 7 years a correspondent in the Press Gallery upstairs and I remember as though it were but yesterday the advent of the tall young man from Minnesota. We soon became acquainted and one of my most prized possessions throughout the years has been the fine, sincere, and unflinching friendship of Marc Sheild. I never dreamed in those early days that I would ever fall from grace and run for office or that 22 years later John N. Garner and Joseph W. Byrns would assign me as a member of the Appropriations Committee where for a long period of years I would be destined to circulate in the same orbit with Marc.

When Marc came to town ox teams had disappeared from the streets of Washington but Dobbin was still competing with the horseless carriage. Only a short time before his advent, members of the Appropriations Committee, recalling the miserable failure of "Darius Green and his flying machine," had been seriously debating in executive session whether there was any sense in making appropriations for flying machines or whether aviation was after all only a magnificent pipe dream. Congress was not in session more than 6 months out of the year in those times. America still had a long way to go before it attained the dignity of becoming a "billion dollar" country, speaking in appropriation lingo, and it was some time later when the Democrats had the delicious satisfaction of tearing into the Republicans for their extravagance in appropriating a billion dollars a year to run the Government. To show how Government expenditures have grown like the proverbial rolling snowball, it may be cited that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1908, the first year of Marc's service with the committee, were \$919,163,823.18, while the appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, including the bill now before the House, total \$61,198,413,854.84.

When Mr. Sheild retires on December 31, he will have served just 37 years with the Appropriations Committee, which includes 29 years in the capacity of clerk of the committee, as distinguished from a subordinate clerkship. During this long service he has saved the taxpayers of this country billions upon billions of dollars. He became clerk of the committee on October 1, 1916, 6 months before our entrance into World War No. 1. His first colossal achievement in behalf of

the taxpayers followed the close of that war when Representative Swagar Sherley, of Louisville, the brilliant and able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, undertook to recapture for the Treasury the vast expended appropriations and unexecuted contract authorizations which could be recovered. It was one of the most peculiar tasks ever undertaken—a task not of appropriating but of unappropriating, as it were, colossal sums already appropriated. It was not a spectacular job that had to be done, but one of infinite grueling details that required a keen analytical mind, a courageous determination, and an inflexible patriotic purpose. The unexpended balances in the hands of department heads, bureau chiefs, and various independent activities when the war ended amounted in sum total to the total property values of many sovereign States.

Naturally Chairman Sherley's recovery efforts met with strong and even bitter resistance. Bureau chiefs had their clutches on the money Congress had appropriated, and in many instances they did not propose to release it without a fight.

It was a gigantic undertaking and success was made possible only by the efforts of Mr. Sheild. He knew all of the infinite details of where this appropriated money was to be found and how it could be recovered and on the basis of the factual information which he furnished Mr. Sherley was able to get through Congress a bill which recaptured the stupendous sum of \$15,411,000,000, including \$7,190,000,000 of appropriations and \$8,221,000,000 of contract authorizations.

Mr. Sheild was clerk of the Appropriations Committee when the budget system was instituted and in those days he was freely consulted in connection with the framing of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and much of the success and value of this sound system of appropriations and Government financing is due to the wisdom of his counsel.

Although Mr. Sheild's work has been unseen and unknown outside the confines of the committee room his imprimatur has been written all over the appropriation laws of these epochal times of national emergency. Since Pearl Harbor our subcommittee on deficiencies, comprised of 12 of the ranking members of the Appropriations Committee, has drafted bills appropriating \$101,963,487,593.51, including the bill now before the House. This is a prodigious sum, over one hundred thousand million dollars, the equivalent of one-third of the total wealth of the United States as shown by the last census of national wealth. It is the equivalent of \$52,235,000 for every year since the birth of Christ and \$143,000 for every day since the beginning of the Christian era.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I fear that I already have taken too much time, but I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is speaking of deficiencies; he speaks of billion-dollar deficiencies. When the regular appropriations fall that much short, or exceed their budget that much, does the gentleman feel it is good business?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say that the deficiency subcommittee has original jurisdiction over many of these large amounts, relating to national defense. They were not deficiencies, generally speaking, although they were handled by the subcommittee on deficiencies.

Mr. WHITE. Under any logical arrangement the appropriation bill would cover the particular departments. If they exceed their budget by a billion dollars it shows poor business somewhere, does it not?

Mr. LUDLOW. I will discuss that with the gentleman later.

Mr. Chairman, this staggering amount illustrates the inevitable cost of war. It has been a most familiar occurrence to hear some Member say in the course of consideration of a perplexing item: "Let us hear what Marc has to say about it."

Marc's exposition of the subject has invariably been most clarifying and illuminating and more often than I can say it has determined the decision.

While Marc has been ever mindful of those whose sweat and toil must pay the bills he has never subordinated the progress of our country to a policy of rigid economy. He has been very broad in his views and progressive in his ideas. He has a pioneering mind which envisions the unseen possibilities of progress in every field of human endeavor and he has steadfastly given encouragement to ideas that offer promise of fruitful fulfillment.

Service as clerk of the Appropriations Committee, arduous as its duties are, seems to be conducive to longevity. The committee was created in 1865, 80 years ago, and during that time it has had only three clerks, whose periods of service were as follows: Robert J. Stevens, 19 years; James C. Courts, 32 years; Marcellus C. Sheild, 29 years.

Mr. Sheild, in his long span of public service, has served under seven Presidents: Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He has served under nine Speakers: Cannon, Clark, Gillett, Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, and Rayburn. There has been no partisanship in recognizing Mr. Sheild's talents. He was first appointed as assistant clerk by a Republican, Chairman Tawney, and was promoted to be clerk by a Democrat, Chairman Fitzgerald.

Administrations have come and administrations have gone, political parties have risen to the zenith and descended to the nadir, but Mr. Sheild has gone serenely on his way, unruffled by political winds and undisturbed by the vicissitudes of politics.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been struck always with Marc Sheild's fine honor and his splendid integrity in answering every question, fairly and squarely. His high ability, his energy, his wide information are outstanding and all through these years with the hundreds and hundreds of Congressmen with whom he has worked, everyone has respected him and he has pleased us all. He is a truly remarkable man.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for that well-deserved tribute. I am happy to have it included in my discussion.

The importance of the clerkship of the Appropriations Committee once created a fiery exchange of compliments on the floor of the House when Uncle Joe Cannon was chairman of the committee and James C. Courts was its clerk. David DeArmond, of Missouri, a master of sarcasm, punctured a speech of Uncle Joe's by saying that he need not preen himself on his achievements as everybody knew that the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations had made the reputation of every chairman of the committee, whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. To this Uncle Joe retorted: "That is so. The clerk is efficient. I wish to God somebody would hire an equally efficient clerk for the gentleman who has just made the attack on me."

It has been the custom of Appropriations Committee chairmen and sub-chairmen since time runneth not to the contrary to shower praise on Mr. Sheild and the presentation of an appropriation bill to the House would seem altogether incomplete without that pleasant diversion. Mr. Sheild's ears must have burned on many occasions when exalted tribute was paid to him on the floor of this House. On May 5, 1921, Uncle Joe Cannon told the House:

I want to say that there never was a more valuable clerk or a more valuable public official than the present clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Marcellus C. Sheild.

On June 23, 1922, Martin Madden, then chairman of the committee, said in presenting an amendment increasing Mr. Sheild's salary:

I have never known a man in all the history of my experience so well qualified, with so comprehensive a knowledge of Government matters as Mr. Sheild. He really is worth anything the Government might be called upon to pay him and it would be a serious loss to the Government if by any chance he should separate himself from it. Every member of the Committee on Appropriations loves and trusts the man as they love and trust nobody else. He is worthy of the love and confidence of the country and particularly of those who come in daily contact with him. If I were to say all that I would like to say about him he would probably blush.

In presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill to the House on December 9, 1930, Representative Louis C. Cramton, of Michigan, said:

There is no man in the whole organization of government who understands the business of the United States as well as he does.

One of the characteristics of our friend is his modesty. I have no doubt that if he could have his way he would prefer to drop out of sight unhonored and unsung, but his friends will not have it that way. On the completion of his thirty-fifth anniversary with the committee I proposed to describe his virtues in a speech in the House as I am attempting today but he got wind of what was going on and requested me to desist. This time I have got the drop on him and I intend to say what is in my heart.

Mr. Sheild's faithfulness to the Appropriations Committee will always remain a charming chapter in his personal history. Many a time business concerns, recognizing his extraordinary qualifications, have offered him salaries far in excess of his salary as clerk of the Appropriations Committee, and key positions in various branches of the Government have been dangled before him, but he has remained steadfast and true in the position that has claimed so much of his life's efforts.

And now, as the shades begin to lengthen, he is to have a deserved rest. With sad hearts we bid him farewell. He leaves behind him a host of friends, for he himself has always possessed in fullest measure the gracious gift of friendliness. Unlike many geniuses he has never succumbed to cynicism and his attitude toward life has been sweet and wholesome. The Capitol is never going to seem the same without him. He now has two objects in view, viz:

First. To locate on a farm.

Second. To write a book.

We can envision Marc in the future seated in the shade of an apple tree on his farm, with meadowlarks singing all around and perhaps with a jug of cider by his side, while he writes his book, and for prudential reasons some of us will be hoping that he won't tell all he knows in that book. Playing at his feet is his one and only grandchild, Marc Rhinehart, and we can hear little Marc say: "Grandpa, I want \$25 to buy a bicycle."

And we can hear Marc, Sr., thrown off of his balance by the interruption, ask absentmindedly: "Have you got a budget estimate for the amount?"

And then we can see him recover his poise and hand his grandson \$25 quicker than snowflakes melt in the nether region.

Deeply regretful as we are of the severance of the ties that bind us to Mr. Sheild, we say to him as he passes from the stage of action: "Good-bye, old friend! With loving hearts we will be thinking of you and wishing for you what you so richly deserve—success and happiness."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, if I possessed great literary ability, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow], which I do not, and if I had the time to prepare an eulogy of the splendid record of Mr. Marc Sheild, which I have not, I could not add in any degree, however minuscule, to what has been so truthfully and beautifully said.

I think I am the only Member of the House who was here when Mr. Sheild began his long career under the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Tawney.

We who know him so well and value his character and ability so highly have come to lean heavily upon this prominent authority in all matters affecting Government appropriations.

He has demonstrated that rigid honesty and faithful and selfless application to onerous and important duties do break down many invidious bars and

lead to reward and renown. When he became an employee of this House the appropriations of the entire country, as I stated before, were not nearly so great as they are today in any one department alone. I was present and voted at the time we created the enlarged Committee on Appropriations, about 1923, which creation gave the sole power of appropriating to one committee of the House, instead of having it done by several legislative committees. When these enlarged committees in the Senate and the House were created Mr. Sheild was made clerk of our Committee on Appropriations, and he has faithfully served in that capacity ever since.

We all fully appreciate the task of that committee and the service of this faithful gentleman. I frequently think of the work of our Committee on Appropriations and wonder whether that great committee should continue to be burdened by that tremendous task or whether we should again return to the legislative committees the jurisdiction we took from them.

However, I am not going into that controversial matter fully, appreciating that there are several other gentlemen who are desirous to add to what has been stated about the gentleman who is about to leave us with our very best wishes.

I exceedingly regret that the House, and especially the Committee on Appropriations, should lose such a valuable, efficient, and dependable man.

Fortunately it is understood that our friend proposes to continue to give his country the result of his vast erudition in connection with governmental appropriations, which means that his services will still be devoted to the welfare of our country. For this we shall be grateful. I wish Mr. Sheild well, because he is undoubtedly a gentleman of singular worth of mind and character.

Before concluding I want to say that I think it is a good practice to assess and evaluate the services of successful public servants while they live, so as to encourage them and others to even a more earnest endeavor, if possible, rather than postpone our appreciative words till their objects are dead.

I do not desire to take any further time, because I see about me many gentlemen who are waiting for me to give way so that they, too, may have an opportunity to voice their appreciation of the very useful service this outstanding servant has rendered the House and the whole country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] such time as he may desire.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress 30 years ago last Saturday, somewhat of a neophyte as regards the Federal Legislature but ready and eager to learn.

As I look about this Hall I can see or recall but five men whose service here today antedates my own. I am, in other words, one of the old men—maybe I should say "tired old men"—of the Congress.

Like most Members, it was not long before I found the folks back home

urging me to seek an appropriation for a project. For the benefit of the newer Members, I am frank to say that was not uncommon as far back as 30 years ago.

When I received this request from home, I hid myself over to the Committee on Appropriations, and I there met for the first time Marc Sheild, the man for whom we have set aside a part of today's session to pay homage.

I met on that day a man. From that hour, I am happy and proud to say that he and I have been stanch friends, and from that hour, I freely acknowledge, I have worn a path to his office, and, as an aside, I might remind you that since then I have been reelected 16 times. I will not give Marc all of the credit, but I am willing to share a great deal of it with him.

Marc Sheild possesses all of the qualities men admire in their kind. The four most important are intelligence, sympathy, forthrightness, and, as men say, if I may use the term, "he-manness." He is not lacking in a single one.

As every Member can well appreciate, since I have been chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, dating back to December 1931, I have been confronted with procedural problems which called for the wisest counsel I could get. Time and again I have turned to this exceptionally learned and wise counselor for advice and guidance, and never left him without profit.

Mr. Chairman, the House can ill afford to lose the services and counsel of this truly great man and public servant.

Unquestionably he has earned a surcease from the arduous labors his position for so many years have forced him to perform, and I, because of my great esteem and affection for him, would be the last one in the world to propose any course contrary to his wishes, but, in all sincerity and with every sense of appreciation of his right to the rest he has so completely earned, I earnestly urge, should he be willing to accept, that the House create a special position commensurate with Marc's great capacity and dignity, in which, without the long hours and tax upon physical endurance such as he experienced in the position he is about to vacate, he would be available to the Speaker, the floor leaders of both parties, and committee chairmen generally upon the problems of a nonpolitical character with which all are daily confronted.

Marc Sheild has the confidence and respect of every man who knows him—and the number is legion—and all would profit, and the country as a whole would profit, if he were available, even periodically, or, upon call, to give us the benefit of his counsel made so valuable through his long years of service, enhanced by his inherent good judgment and sound common sense.

Whatever the course may be as to his future, I am proud to acknowledge my great respect and admiration and esteem for this truly great man and I know I am unanimously joined by my colleagues in wishing him and those dear to him every good and kind blessing under the sun.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, Congress will not be the same to me when Mr. Marcellus Sheild leaves. It has been an outstanding privilege for me for the past 30 years to be able to call him my close personal friend. My contact with him has been almost daily. When I had a difficult problem I would always consult Marc. His counsel and advice have been extremely beneficial to me.

I do not feel that anyone who knows him will challenge the statement that he is as well informed on the fiscal affairs of the Government as any individual. Aside from that, his knowledge of the workings of the various departments and independent agencies of the Government is not surpassed by anyone. This, together with his personality, outstanding character, and integrity, has made him a most important part of the legislative establishment. If the people were aware of how the Appropriations Committee functions and the part the clerk of the committee takes, they would better understand how indispensable Mr. Sheild has been to the members of that committee. Take the bill now before the House. Deficiency and supplemental appropriation requests are messaged to the House by the President. Each item is separate and is printed. The clerk is charged with putting the requests in bill form. Mr. Sheild, having a thorough knowledge of parliamentary law, is capable of preparing a tentative bill, the legality of which cannot be questioned. The tentative bill ready, the clerk then arranges a calendar, notifies the heads of the departments or agencies concerned when to appear to justify their requests for additional money. For 2 weeks or more members of the committee question the officials as to previous appropriations and how they were spent.

When the hearings are over the permanent bill is then prepared. When agreed upon by the subcommittee, it is presented to the full committee and then to the House. The Members, I am sure, have noticed the many books on the committee table when the bill is under consideration. Whenever a Member raises a point of order you will find Mr. Sheild reaching for a book and then pointing out the authority to the member of the committee in charge. When Members question the advisability of an appropriation again you will find Mr. Sheild pointing out to members of the subcommittee the hearings marked with additional information, to answer the attack on the appropriation.

After the House acts on the bill the clerk follows it to the Senate and when passed by the Senate prepares it for conference. He sits with the conferees and finally writes the conference report. It is a job that one cannot learn overnight.

I know that Mr. Sheild did not come to a final decision in regard to leaving the Congress, taking his own welfare solely into consideration. He had told me that as long as he remained as clerk of the committee his loyal associates on the committee had no opportunity for advancement. He was thinking of his subordinates and it was not until he was assured that if he left the committee the other clerks would be promoted

before he announced to the chairman his determination to retire.

We are going to miss Mr. Sheild, and I am sure that he leaves with the best wishes of every Member of this House. He is not the type of man that can be inactive, and I understand he is going to do some writing. For this I know he is well qualified due to his command of the English language.

I am not going to say good-bye to him because the contact I have had with him during a long period of years will be continued.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure Mr. Sheild will be pleased at the discussion concerning employees of the Congress.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] spoke with reference to the faithful employees of the House. We have long disregarded taking proper care of our employees. There is a movement on foot now, through the efforts of Senator MALONEY and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], to reorganize the House and Senate. In that reorganization it is intended to recognize these faithful employees so that we will not be losing them. In my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Accounts, I know there were 175 turn-overs in the personnel in the offices of the Members of Congress in 1 month. Why? Because those employees could secure more money downtown. They secured more benefits. They received overtime. They received 30 days' leave. They received 30 days' sick leave. We provided that for the employees in the executive branch of the Government, but we did not provide for our own employees.

When we passed the Federal Employees' Retirement Act it was for those in the executive branch of the Government, but we did not provide for our own employees nor for the judicial branch. I can tell you now that one of the men in this House who joined with me in my efforts to include the legislative employees and judicial employees in the Retirement Act was Mr. Sheild.

I referred a few minutes ago to the limitations on legislative provisions in this bill. The gentleman from Virginia said:

The first thing we should do is provide an additional clerk for Members of this House.

I agree with the gentleman. Over half the Members of this House since we came here on November 14 have petitioned me and other members of the Committee on Accounts to do something to assist them so that they can properly handle their mail. I have prepared an amendment that will take care of that. It will provide for an additional clerk at \$3,000, and it places the limitation by which you can pay one clerk in your office \$5,000 instead of \$4,500. That amendment is subject to a point of order. I have been informed that if I offer the amendment a point of order will be made. What I want to show here now is that it seems all right to put a limitation and legislative provisions in this bill for the benefit of the executive departments, although those legislative provisions are subject to a point of order. If you are going to make a point of order against one, why not against all? Or if we can

do it for the executive branch of the Government, why can we not do it for the legislative branch? The slogan seems to be "Take care of the others, but do not take care of yourself." No Member is having anything put over on him. If my amendment is offered, every Member of this House will know what he is voting on. Let their conscience be their guide. If they want to support it, well and good. If they do not want to support it, they do not have to support it. If it passes and they do not need the extra clerk hire, then let them not accept it.

A great majority of the Members of this House say they need help. The postmaster tells me the mail has more than doubled. As I said before the Committee on Rules the other day, the lights are burning every night in almost every other office in the two office buildings. They are working at night and a great number of the Members of this House are paying out of their own pocket for additional clerical assistance.

As I say, nobody is trying to put anything over on any other Member. They would not be justified in coming in here and saying: "I did not know anything about it." That is what they did when we provided for putting the Members of Congress under the Retirement Act. That passed and then one Member in the other body said that for 1 day's pay a Member could get under the Retirement Act under that provision. I know what it would have cost me to get under the Retirement Act. Under that provision when that bill passed the House I contacted the Retirement Division of the Civil Service Commission to find out what it would cost me to benefit under it. The man came down to my office, prepared the statement and gave it to me. Do you know what it would have cost me to get under the Retirement Act? Not 1 day's pay but \$8,900 and \$51 a month as long as I was in the Congress of the United States. I could have benefited by it because I had passed the age limit. The Speaker of the House, who would have had to pay close to \$15,000 to get in under that act, could not have benefited because he had not reached the age limit as provided by the bill. That was the most unfair criticism ever directed at a law passed by the Congress. It resulted in repeal. Since then newspaper men and women will tell you that the criticism directed at that act was not justified. Now, as I say, if the Members of the House want to help themselves it is up to them to do it. You can be sure it will be done in the next Congress, a general reorganization. As I said, I know it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but this change can be made only by law. If it could be made by a House resolution I would bring the resolution on the floor of the House immediately from my committee. I am authorized by the committee to do it. Last Friday I called a meeting of my committee. Every member of the committee but one is in favor of the amendment. That one said he preferred that it go over until after January. Two members of the committee were out of the city. The others all favored it and directed me to ask the Appropriations

Committee to put the provision in this bill, which I did. I ask that if you can put legislative provisions in this bill for the executive branch of the Government why can we not put a legislative provision in the bill for the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely fitting and proper that we should pause in our deliberations for a few moments to pay tribute to one of the distinguished employees of this House, who has rendered to the Congress of the United States and to the American people most faithful and effective service for a period of 36 years.

Marc Sheild comes from the great State of Minnesota that I have the honor to represent in part. Naturally, we who come from the great North Star State take a pardonable pride in his outstanding accomplishments and brilliant record.

Mr. Sheild was brought to Washington by the late James A. Tawney, then chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, in January 1908. Since that time he has served under 11 chairmen, all of them men of outstanding ability. They were Tawney, of Minnesota, who appointed him as assistant clerk; Fitzgerald, of New York; Sherley, of Kentucky; Good, of Iowa; Madden, of Illinois; Anthony, of Kansas; Wood, of Indiana; Byrns, of Tennessee; Buchanan, of Texas; Taylor, of Colorado; and the present able and distinguished chairman, Mr. Cannon of Missouri.

In addition to his arduous and responsible duties as clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Sheild has also served as clerk of a select committee on the Budget, appointed to frame the original legislation establishing the present budgetary system in the Federal Government. In addition, he has served as clerk to other special committees having to do with financial legislation, including several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee.

We who come from Minnesota take particular pride in the splendid service that Mr. Marc Sheild has rendered to the American people and to the Congress of the United States. I am almost at a loss for words to express my regret at his leaving the Congress. His severance from the service will be a serious and a heavy loss to the great Appropriations Committee, and I can speak from personal knowledge because the minority of the Ways and Means Committee sustained a similar loss last April; but, unlike the Ways and Means Committee, the Appropriations Committee already has a very able man to take Mr. Sheild's place, and in that they are to be congratulated.

I do not know what Mr. Sheild's plans may be for the future, but I am sure that I echo the sentiment of every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle when I say that we wish for him length of years, good health, and contentment in his retirement and well-earned rest.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I desire to join with my colleague from Minnesota and other Members of the House by expressing my sincere felicitations and best wishes to our very good friend, Marc Sheild. He was reared and educated in Winona, Minn., which is in the congressional district that I have had the honor of representing in Congress for the past 10 years. During my years of service in the House, I have always felt that I was the personal representative of Marc Sheild. Not only has he been my friend, but his advice and assistance have been of great value to me in my work as a Representative. I want to personally thank him for all that he has done to help me. I hope that he will decide to return to my district in Minnesota, for he will have a royal welcome from his many friends in Winona, who join with me in wishing him and his family the best of health and many years of happiness in his retirement from his present post. We regret to see Marc Sheild leave our company, but when he retires at the end of this year, with him will go the good wishes of a host of friends who respect him for his many fine qualities and the outstanding service he has rendered to his country during the past 36 years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I can well understand the pardonable pride that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDRESEN, takes in Mr. Sheild. The gentleman represents the district which was formerly represented by Mr. Tawney, who brought Mr. Sheild down here. I congratulate the gentleman on having such a distinguished and outstanding American as a constituent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I have listened this afternoon with great attention to all of the words spoken with reference to Mr. Sheild. I was very much concerned about Mr. Sheild so I went over and felt his pulse and looked at him. He is all right up to the present time, and I hope he continues that way.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I doubt if any Member of this House is able to find words to adequately express the feeling not only of the Members of the House, but of the press and of all the people who came in contact with Mr. Sheild during his service on the Committee on Appropriations. The other day I figured that the appropriations made by the Committee during Mr. Sheild's term in office as assistant clerk and clerk were about \$580,000,000,000. That, Mr. Chairman, is calculated to be twice the amount of the wealth of the United States from the last census figures. Of all of the appropriations that were made and passed through Mr. Sheild's hands, that amount is twice the estimated wealth of this country. That will show, Mr. Chairman, the terrific amount of work that has passed through the Committee on Appropriations, with the assistance of Mr. Sheild.

There was a remark made the other day by one of the men in the office, which

remark I wrote down at that time. I would like to read it so as to give a real picture of the Mr. Sheild we are talking about today. The gentleman told me that in more than a quarter of a century during which he had worked with Mr. Sheild that he never saw a frown on his face; never heard him raise his voice to any employee in the office, and he deemed it a favor to have worked with what he termed a real man in all that word implies.

Mr. Chairman, I think that really expresses the views and the opinions and the sentiments of all the Members of this House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the way to have friends is to be one. Judged by that saying, the gentleman about whom we are speaking today should have as many friends as he has acquaintances, because he has always been friendly and helpful to everyone with whom he comes in contact.

I esteem it a privilege to join my colleagues here today in paying tribute to Marcellus C. Sheild, who has for so many years faithfully and efficiently served the people of the Nation as a clerk in the Appropriations Committee.

Listening to the other speakers here, I find that he has served under six Democratic chairmen and five Republican chairmen. I dare say he has served as faithfully and as impartially the Democrats as he has the Republicans, and the Republicans as he has the Democrats.

To me he epitomizes more than any man I have ever known the ideal career public servant, a man of ability, of character, of integrity, and most important, perhaps of all in that type of service, a man who serves impartially whoever may be directing the policies of the work in which he is engaged.

I shall use him in years to come as I have in years which have passed as an argument for the selection of Government personnel on the basis of merit and their retention upon the basis of efficiency and faithful service, because he is a living argument for that principle, in which I believe.

I am glad he is able to retire, although I am sorry to see him leave the service of the Congress. I take some pride in the fact that it was my privilege to sponsor the legislative provision under which he finds it possible to retire on a reasonable annuity before reaching the age in life where he cannot enjoy it.

I wish for Marc Sheild, as we affectionately refer to him, happiness and many years of enjoyment in the retirement he has so richly earned and which comes to him as a merited reward for his faithful, efficient, and impartial service to Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I commend and indorse the high tribute paid Marc Sheild by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the whip of the

House, who is now speaking. I take this occasion to observe that during all my service in the House I have come to know and value Marc Sheild. I heard when I came here a good many years ago and I believe it to be true that no man in the Government of the United States knows more about its fiscal affairs than Marc Sheild. His going will be a distinct loss to the Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from Texas is eminently correct. It will be a distinct loss not only to the Congress but to the taxpayers of the country. Thanks to the policy the Appropriations Committee has followed, and which I thoroughly approve, we have already trained a successor who is eminently qualified to step into that position.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I concur in the very high esteem in which Mr. Sheild is held by the Members of the House, and I join in expressing my personal appreciation of his splendid service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I can only wish that other committees in this body would follow the policy which has been adopted by the Appropriations Committee of selecting for members of its staff young men of good character, reasonable intelligence and education, and keeping those who render efficient and faithful service, without regard to any political affiliation or without regard to political control of the committee. If we did that, we would not hear so much of a cry as to the inadequacy of the staffs of our committees as we do at the present time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I heartily second everything that the gentleman from Georgia has said about Marc Sheild. It happens that Marc Sheild lives in my congressional district in South Dakota, about 30 miles from my home town. He comes from a fine family, and the very long and creditable career he has had in Washington as a congressional clerk has done much out in South Dakota to enhance the reputation of Congress and the reputation of good government. I want to join with the gentleman from Georgia in everything that he has said about Marc Sheild.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that his service here has reflected credit, not only upon himself and upon the Committee on Appropriations, but on the House in general. I wish him every possible happiness in the years to come. I hope he will come back to see us and that his years may be many.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am both glad and sorry as these exercises

are being held. I am sorry to see Marc Sheild leave us and glad to have a part in wishing him well upon his leaving the service of the Government.

I do not think that a heavier stroke could have been dealt to the House of Representatives, and especially to the great Committee on Appropriations, than the retirement of Marc Sheild. While I am on my feet, I am going to take a moment to say something that is very close to my heart. That is, I think each and every major committee in the House of Representatives is understaffed. If I can have my way in the next Congress, we are going to do something about it. Further than that, I feel that the office of each and every Member of the House of Representatives is understaffed, and if we cannot do anything about that today, I hope we will do something about it in the near future.

In my opinion, a better man, a more able man, and more gentle man never served the House of Representatives or served with it, than Marc Sheild. I deeply regret that he is leaving us, because it touches me deeply, personally. I have known this splendid man for more than 30 years. I have watched his actions. I have noted his great ability and his fine talents. I am of the opinion that after he has been able to rest for a few months, he will be called back into public service. In other words, that he may be drafted to come back, because there is not a job that I know of, in the public service, which Marc Sheild could not do in an outstanding way. I wish him health and a reasonable degree of prosperity in the years that lie ahead of him.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me I, too, would like to pay my tribute and my respects to a gentleman who, in my opinion, has rendered a magnificent and signal service to the Government of the United States over a period of a third of a century, an entire generation.

It has been my happy privilege to serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee for the past 12 years and, during that time, I have had innumerable opportunities to observe the splendid work of Marc Sheild. No man in the United States Government knows more of the inner workings of the Government than Marc. The advice and wise counsel during the trying years behind us has been highly appreciated by all.

Although we members of the Appropriations Committee regret Marc's retirement we all wish him well and wish him Godspeed, knowing that in leaving the Appropriations Committee we can all say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the decision of Marc Sheild to retire as chief clerk of the Appropriations Committee means a very great loss to the committee, to the Congress, and to the Nation.

For 29 years he has filled the position of clerk of the committee and for 8 years before that the position of its assistant clerk, a total of 37 years.

His period of service has included the difficult years of World War No. 1 and

World War No. 2 and the trying years between them.

He has served under 11 chairmen of the committee: Chairman Tawney, of Minnesota; Chairman Fitzgerald, of New York; Chairman Sherley, of Kentucky; Chairman Good, of Iowa; Chairman Madden, of Illinois; Chairman Anthony, of Kansas; Chairman Wood, of Indiana; Chairman Byrns, of Tennessee; Chairman Buchanan, of Texas; Chairman Taylor, of Colorado; and Chairman Cannon, of Missouri.

He has the distinction of being one of three persons who have held the position of clerk of the committee since the committee was created, 80 years ago.

Few men in America have the comprehensive grasp of the organization and financial operations of the Federal Government which he possesses.

He has served with integrity, fidelity, and conspicuous ability.

He will be greatly missed by those now in the Congress with whom he has worked on the tremendous problems which have confronted the Appropriations Committee in recent years.

He carries with him the best wishes of all for many happy years in the consciousness of 37 years of outstanding public service to the Congress and to the Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 15 minutes that he may yield to others.

I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been very considerable talk about the staffing of our committees, the staffing of the House and the staffing of our offices. It seems to me that is an item which should be taken up on a legislative bill and legislation passed covering anything of that character before action is taken.

With reference to all of the committees that need help to do the work that has been thrown upon them, that should be considered very carefully and it should be on the basis of what they need, and not on any snap judgment. Likewise, whatever is considered for the offices of the Members should be after very careful consideration by a legislative committee. I do not believe it should be handled on a deficiency appropriation bill here on the floor.

I am making that statement because I believe I should make it at this time. I am serving notice that I do not intend to have legislation of that kind written into an appropriation bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman justify why his committee will bring in a deficiency appropriation bill containing legislation applying to the executive branch of the Government and decline to do the same thing for the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. TABER. We have only done that with reference to other matters where it has been absolutely necessary that we take up that jurisdiction. That is not a welcome jurisdiction to any member of the Appropriations Committee. We only do it in emergencies. This other

situation is a situation that can be handled very promptly and very quickly by joint resolution or by action of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman certainly is too well informed on parliamentary law to know that you cannot amend a law by concurrent resolution.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I never said anything of the kind and the gentleman could not infer anything of the kind from what I said. I do not think I will yield further, because I do not care to get into a discussion of that type with the gentleman. I have stated my position on the situation. That position is perfectly proper and perfectly clear, and I intend to stick to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are there not provisions in this bill relating to the executive departments which are legislative, and subject to a point of order?

Mr. TABER. There are some that we had to put in, yes; but there was no other way of handling the matter at this time. There are not many. This bill is as clear of legislation as the committee could make it.

There are a great many cuts under budget estimates in this bill. Some of those cuts came from items that have been heretofore submitted and denied by regular committees. Some of them came from new budget estimates that have been submitted. For instance, there was a cut of \$75,900,000 in connection with the Federal Works Administration where a budget estimate was submitted with the view of setting up upward of 520 positions in the Federal Works Administration to regiment absolutely and control the plans and the types of plans that States and municipalities might have for their own public works to be paid for by themselves. The impetus for that was the legislation that was passed here relating to post-war reconversion. In my opinion the estimate was entirely unjustified. If there was to be a distribution among the States of funds it only required 10 or 12 people, and neither the legislation itself nor anything connected with it permitted the regimentation of the States and the States' activities.

Then there was a cut in housing appropriations from \$20,000,000 to \$10,000,000, so-called war housing. There are some people who feel that we should spend more money on that. I am not one of them. This proposed war housing was, in cost at least, 80 percent of the type which would take until the 1st of July to build and to put into commission. I do not believe we ought to go ahead with permanent family dwellings in so-called war housing that will take that long; nor do I believe they will be of any use in connection with the war effort.

Another amount of \$15,000,000 was recommended for so-called community facilities. The committee allowed half of this. In my opinion they allowed too

much, because I do not believe that proper operation of the outfit would result in the expenditure of so much money.

There are some items in here to which I shall not offer an amendment because they are for some of our allies in the war with reference to cultural relations. But frankly I cannot pass that item without expressing the keenest disappointment in the fact that Mr. MacLeish, who is head of the Congressional Library, who has made a failure of that job, who made a failure of the Office of Facts and Figures, has been drafted into the State Department to make a failure of this job. I do not like to see a mess made of our administrative governmental relationships, and that is what this activity is headed for with Mr. MacLeish administering it. I am in hopes the other body may take care of that situation when it comes to confirmation. A proven failure is not the kind of fellow to start off to do a good job with.

There are estimates in the bill involving a lot of statistical work. I am not going to offer amendments to them at this time because I do not believe I will succeed.

There are \$12,000,000 in here, and at least \$5,000,000 of it relates to studies such as on consumers' income and that sort of thing involved in three or four different items, which are going to be of no value whatever. I am sure that will be a waste of money because it is going to be done at a time of peak war employment and is going to be of little value in connection with reconversion that is to come.

There were estimates submitted to us with reference to Alaska along lines that did not sound intelligent, and the committee cut out about \$5,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there was an item submitted for the Navy of nearly \$350,000,000, and we have allowed with reappropriation all of it that could be used. We believe that it is necessary to supply the armed forces at this time with everything that they can possibly need in connection with the war effort. The activity that they are engaging in beyond the Budget estimate with this money is a new activity which was not in full blast and was not planned to be so at the time the Navy bill was up for consideration last spring; therefore, there is a legitimate reason for a deficiency along this line.

Another item that we have allowed has been for a continuation of war labor importation under the War Food Administration. That is continued until the 31st of December 1945. The funds that will be unexpended, which, in my opinion, will run somewhere around \$10,000,000 based upon past experience, and a contract authorization for \$10,000,000 more to be entered into before the 1st of July 1945, is provided. This will, in my opinion, permit importation of the necessary Mexican labor to take care of the California fruit and vegetable crop situation, and it will take care of the importation of Bahamian and Jamaican labor insofar as necessary to take care

of the crop situation in the South and the East. It will also provide for a continuance of the cooperation between the Extension Service in Washington and the Extension Service in the States, to recruit local labor for the farms. I believe this is a necessary activity and we have provided for it in such manner that it can go on as it did last year, and perhaps a little better, because it will permit the representatives of the War Food Administration to immediately go down into Mexico and begin to recruit labor.

I think that that is about all I care to say about the bill. There have been cuts of nearly 25 percent in the Budget estimates that were submitted to us. I am in hopes that the committee will continue that kind of a record all the way through the next 2 years. I know that I shall give the best that I have to try to bring that about.

That is about all I care to say about the bill at this time unless there are some questions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. With reference to the item for continuing the importation of foreign labor, as I understand the program will be carried on practically the same as it has been during the current year?

Mr. TABER. Except that we will permit them to start recruiting a little earlier than they did before. This will permit them to go to Mexico, the Bahamas, and Jamaica and make their arrangements sent away so that there will be no delay in having these laborers available for work when they are needed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And they are also permitted to make contracts for the whole crop year instead of just up to June 30?

Mr. TABER. Yes; that is correct. I hope it will work a little better.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. What is that amount for?

Mr. TABER. That is for additional facilities. Some of it will be in the nature of office buildings and fixing up office space so that we may take care of the needs of the servicemen as they come back. There is \$7,085,000 for that purpose. They are going to decentralize the activities of the loaning agencies, and they will have to do the same thing with the claims agencies on more of a scale than they have before.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Under the G. I. bill they are opening up new offices?

Mr. TABER. Yes; they have to. There are some new offices, and then there are enlargements of other offices insofar as possible at the same place that some other facility already exists. Then there is \$750,000 for modification of one of the hospital facilities in Penn-

sylvania; a reconditioning of some reservations that are being transferred by the Army, like Fort Meade, S. Dak., and Fort Washington, Md.; temporary housing facilities for limited service Army enlisted men; temporary construction for regional office expansion pending permanent construction, \$750,000. There is an emergency bed expansion item, \$624,000; dental expansion of about \$84,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not at all satisfied with the progress of the construction for the hospitals. I am very sure that both the Army and the Navy will have to keep patients in the hospital longer than if they had the beds ready. They are very short of nurses as well as doctors in the Veterans' Administration. They are not opening wards even though they have some of the facilities. It is a very bad situation.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The effort certainly ought to be made. There is no excuse for not having their own nursing service. They would have had a good nursing service if they had had their own corps a long time ago.

Mr. TABER. I hope they will follow it up and get it straightened out.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I find \$17,559,000 for collection of statistics needed for reconversion, and on page 5 of the report the departments involved in appropriations proposed for this program are listed, and they include Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. This involves a whole lot of statistics that I had assumed they have collected every year as a matter of course, because we have been appropriating rather substantially for statistical work in each of those departments. This \$17,000,000 would provide 500 or 1,000 more people, and it is said that this expenditure is to be mostly for personnel. I wondered what the justification for the expenditures in those departments would be. We are all for having the data needed for reconversion, but I do not see why we do not get it out of our regular departments.

Mr. TABER. There is \$5,500,000 for completing the agricultural census, for which we have already provided a little more than \$7,000,000, if I recall correctly. Then there is \$2,400,000 for the census of manufactures, which unquestionably is desirable.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Have we never done that?

Mr. TABER. There has been no census of manufactures since 1939 and the manufacturers were very anxious that this be done, because it is absolutely necessary that there be a complete picture of just what there is and what there is to do with if there is to be any kind of successful working out of this situation with reference to manufacturing and employment in the days following the

war. But there are in there items with reference to consumers' income investigations in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, studies which are utterly worthless, because this means determining those facts with regard to places where there is temporary high employment and high income, and giving us figures that can be of no value except on an immediate, temporary basis. About \$5,000,000 of that money is absolutely to be wasted, there is no question about that.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understood that very exhaustive studies on consumer income, as far as present wartime income is concerned, were presented to the President and the War Labor Board within the past few months.

Mr. TABER. We have had considerable of that. It is probably as accurate as what we will get under this item. As I said, I believe about \$5,000,000 of that expenditure, coming under the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, and the Census, with reference to that item, is a total waste.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are not those appropriations subject to the objection that they are legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. They might be. I will not say that they are.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am asking the gentleman about that so that I may be guided accordingly.

Mr. TABER. I would not be surprised if they were.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman going to make that objection? He says the item is a waste of money.

Mr. TABER. I would be very much inclined to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice there is an item in connection with foreign service pay relating to an adjustment because of appreciation of foreign currencies. What has been done for our military and naval forces abroad in that connection?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe I could answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I note there is certain additional pay for certain of our men who are in active combat attacking duties, but very unfortunately the stretcher bearers are not included. The stretcher bearers are more out in the open than some of the men doing the actual attacking, besides being unarmed; and a good many of them are injured or killed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have a special arrangement with regard to

the Army and Navy, about the foreign service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice there was an additional pay there of 20 percent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have special arrangement with regard to the Army and Navy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was taken up by me last September and October and I do not think it is entirely meeting the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice that of the funds recommended in the bill for penalty mail cost, the largest single item is for the War Manpower Commission, an item of \$525,300. The only thing that approaches that is the Veterans' Administration, which is for \$446,000. Was there any special justification given to the committee for this large expenditure for mail by the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. TABER. The items that have to be paid for under this, are those over 4 pounds and there were a lot of things that we sent out from here to the regional offices which have to be sent in that way. That is the reason for that being a large item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, I conceive it my duty to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole, the very distressful situation, which exists by reason of the denial by the subcommittee which prepared and brought in the pending bill, of Budget estimates, shown in House Document No. 793, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, intended to take care of earned soil- and water-conservation payments, which will not be paid in full unless that estimate is approved. The matter, I may say, is of no more interest to me than it is or ought to be to the Representatives from a very considerable number of States, particularly of the Southeast and in the West. In many of those States, the farmers have participated in the soil- and water-conservation program to an extent which had not been anticipated by the authorities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration who formulated the program, and as a result the amounts, which have been promised to those farmers for carrying out these practices, many of which have been carried out at considerable expense to them, will not be paid in full, but will be reduced in amount and only a part of the obligation of the Government to these farmers discharged, unless this Budget estimate which has been disallowed by the committee is approved by the Congress during their consideration of the pending bill.

I insert here the Budget estimate and extracts from the hearings and from the report of the committee:

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION FOR AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, November 30, 1944. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed)

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, November 29, 1944.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945.

The details of the proposed provision, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its transmission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D. C., November 25, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House,

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945, as follows:

"CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

"The limitation on expenditures under the 1944 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices established in the fourth proviso clause of the appropriation 'Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources,' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby increased from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000 (exclusive of the \$12,500,000 provided in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, for additional seed payments)."

The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, under the item "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources," authorized the Department to formulate 1944 programs of soil-building and soil- and water-conservation practices under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, should not exceed \$300,000,000. Thus for the first time Congress eliminated production adjustment payments, and established a limitation on the agricultural conservation program other than that provided in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Pursuant to this authorization, the Agricultural Adjustment Agency formulated a 1944 agricultural conservation program, the total expenditures in connection with which were within the \$300,000,000 limitation established by Congress, and announced such programs to the farmers of the country on February 9, 1944. In formulating that program, approximately \$263,000,000 was apportioned among the States for payments to farmers, and approximately \$10,000,000 was reserved against the contingency of possible overparticipation in the program. While no production adjustment payments were provided in the 1944 program, the available funds were apportioned to the States in the same

general way as the distribution made under previous programs, so that each region would get an equitable share of the total available funds. In every case it was estimated, on the basis of past experience, that the recommended program would come within the amount allocated to each State and region. Increased participation is such, however, that the total cost of the program, if payments are made on the basis of announced rates, will exceed the limitation of \$300,000,000 by approximately \$13,000,000.

Unless an increase in the over-all limitation on the 1944 program is granted, it will be necessary to reduce substantially all payments to farmers in the southern region, and, to a lesser extent, similar payments in the western region. Without such an increase, the Agricultural Adjustment Agency has no choice under existing law but to order rates of payments reduced so that expenditures will not exceed the \$300,000,000 limitation. Since the 1944 program is the first program under which emphasis has been on conservation practices, and since the unprecedented participation in that program could not be estimated accurately, it is recommended that the over-all limitation of \$300,000,000 be increased to \$313,000,000. Such action would prevent reductions in rates of payment for practices already carried out and earned at announced rates, and would not involve the appropriation of any additional funds, since the amount required to make the payments at the originally scheduled rates can be financed by a corresponding reduction in the amount to be expended for the purpose of conservation materials and services in connection with subsequent programs. In future program years, the increased participation experienced this year would, of course, be taken into account in apportioning the available funds among the regions and the States, and in determining the rates of payment applicable to the various practices.

The foregoing proposed provision is made necessary by reason of contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budgets for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945. I recommend that it be submitted to Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

(Statements of N. E. Dodd, Chief, and D. J. Scruggs, Budget Officer, Agricultural Adjustment Agency; Robert Shields, Solicitor, Department of Agriculture; and W. A. Jump, Budget Officer, Department of Agriculture, Wednesday, November 29, 1944)

OVERPARTICIPATION AND RESULTING DEFICIENCY IN FUND AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dodd, we have an estimate in House Document No. 793 from the Bureau of the Budget proposing to increase from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000 the limitation on expenditures contained in the 1944 appropriation act, as follows:

"The limitation on expenditures under the 1944 program of soil-building practices and soil-and-water-conservation practices established in the fourth proviso clause of the appropriation 'Conservation and use of agricultural land resources' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby increased from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000 (exclusive of the \$12,500,000 provided in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, for additional seed payments)."

Mr. Dodd. Yes, sir. I have a statement explaining the estimate, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to submit for the record.

(The statement follows:)

"CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES"

"The Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, under the item 'Conservation and use of agricultural land resources,' authorized the Department to formulate 1944 programs of soil-building and soil-and-water-conservation practices under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, should not exceed \$300,000,000. Thus, for the first time Congress eliminated production adjustment payments and established a limitation on the agricultural conservation program other than that provided in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"Pursuant to this authorization, the Agricultural Adjustment Agency formulated a 1944 agricultural conservation program, the total expenditures in connection with which were within the \$300,000,000 limitation established by the Congress and announced such program to the farmers of the country on February 9, 1944. In formulating the 1944 program, approximately \$263,000,000 was apportioned among the States for payments to farmers and approximately \$10,000,000 was reserved against the contingency of possible overparticipation in the program. While no production adjustment payments were provided in the 1944 program, the available funds were apportioned to the States in the same general way as the distribution made under

previous programs so that each region would get an equitable share of the total available funds. After establishing allocations for the States, each State committee, with the assistance of a State technical committee, recommended a program to make the most effective use of the funds available for the State. In every case it was estimated, on the basis of past experience, that the recommended program would come within the amount allocated to each State and region. Increased participation is such, however, that the total cost of the program, if payments are made on the basis of the announced rates, will exceed the limitation of \$300,000,000 by approximately \$13,000,000.

"The major portion of this increase in participation has occurred in the southern region, where farmers carried out practices in excess of the estimate made prior to the announcement of the program. A review of the practices carried out by farmers in 1944 in comparison with those carried out in previous years indicates that the increases are much greater than could have reasonably been anticipated even though the original estimates, based on past experience, were well within the range of expectation. It was not believed that farmers, under the pressure of wartime production, could step up their conservation practices so rapidly. However, the need for these practices is generally recognized, and the response of farmers is a high y gratifying development from the standpoint of the national soil-conservation objective.

"The following table summarizes these data for several of the more important practices in the southern region:

Practices carried out under agricultural conservation program, southern region

Practice	Unit	1942	1943	1944	
				First estimate ¹	Present estimate
Superphosphates.....	Tons.....	246, 109	263, 676	222, 500	322, 941
Limestone.....	Tons.....	316, 379	546, 264	824, 500	2, 132, 122
Lespedeza and other summer green manure and cover crops.....	Acres.....	4, 404, 001	3, 570, 346	2, 807, 500	3, 273, 293
Ponds and dams.....	Cubic yards.....	11, 653, 898	12, 339, 752	43, 400, 000	47, 073, 147
Seeding pastures.....	Pounds.....	5, 759, 617	9, 532, 589	6, 878, 386	19, 378, 483
Terraing.....	Linear feet.....	80, 950, 491	268, 196, 867	348, 000, 000	409, 212, 898
Total of above practices.....	Percent.....	100	123	131	213

¹ Estimate made prior to announcement of 1944 program.

"In certain cases it will be noted that the amounts originally estimated were below the amounts performed under previous programs. In the case of superphosphate, this underestimate was due largely to uncertainty as to the supply which would be available. In the case of summer green manure and cover crops, the practice was greatly restricted as to crops and areas which would qualify for payment in 1944 as compared with earlier years, and it was estimated this would result in a lesser performance of the practice. In the case of pasture seeding, the extent to which farmers had used this practice in 1943 was underestimated at the time the original estimates of 1944 performance were prepared. On the whole, however, it is clearly evident that 1944 performance is much higher than could reasonably have been hoped for at the time the original estimates were made.

"It happens that the two practices which showed the greatest increases in 1944—that is, the seeding of permanent pastures and the use of limestone—are practices the need for which is generally recognized throughout the South. The soils of the South need far greater amounts of limestone annually than are being applied even at the 1944 rate, and the acreage of improved pasture now existing is only a fraction of that needed for a sound agricultural economy.

"In order to meet this situation, it will be necessary to reduce substantially all pay-

ments in the southern region, as set forth and provided in our 1944 Agricultural Conservation Bulletin. (See p. 917, House hearings, 1945 agricultural appropriation bill.) This will be true of payments to farmers in the western region also, but to a much less extent. The Agricultural Adjustment Agency has no choice under existing law but to order rates of payment reduced so that expenditures will not exceed the \$300,000,000 limitation. However, since the 1944 program is the first program the total emphasis of which has been on conservation practices, and the unprecedented participation therein could not be accurately estimated, the Congress might desire to make an adjustment in the over-all limitation on the 1944 program (from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000) rather than to have reductions made in rates of payment covering practices already carried out and earned at announced rates. This would not involve the appropriation of any additional funds since the amount required to make the payments at the originally scheduled rates could be financed by a corresponding reduction in the amount to be expended for the purchase of conservation materials and services in connection with the 1945 program. In subsequent program years the increased participation experienced this year will of course be taken into account in apportioning the available funds among the regions and the States and in

determining the rates of payment applicable to the various practices.

"As a result of the increase in performance, farmers participating in the 1944 program have earned more than the amounts originally allocated to the States by \$21,764,685, as follows:

"Original estimates of payments to be paid from State allocations (exclusive of \$12,500,000 provided for additional seed payments in the 1945 act)-----	\$266, 120, 315
"Revised estimate of payment earned to be paid from State allocations-----	287, 885, 000

"Payments earned in excess of allocation to States-----	21, 764, 685
---	--------------

"The 1944 program as planned contemplated expenditures, including administration, of \$291,152,432, or \$8,847,568 less than the limitation set by Congress of \$300,000,000. Therefore, this sum of \$8,847,568 may be applied against the sum of \$21,764,685 earned in excess of the original allocations to the States, thereby reducing the estimated amount by which the limitation of \$300,000,000 would be exceeded and the estimated payments earned by farmers reduced to \$12,917,117. Rather than reduce payments which have already been earned by the farmers to this extent, the limitation on the 1944 program could be increased to \$313,000,000 if the Congress so determines."

INCREASED PARTICIPATION IN SOUTHERN STATES

The CHAIRMAN. This estimate indicates, Mr. Dodd, that increased participation has rendered the presently fixed amount inadequate to pay the announced rates.

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have a statement on that, Mr. Dodd.

Mr. DODD. I think it would be best, perhaps, if I referred you to page 916 of the House hearings on the 1945 agricultural appropriation bill where the A. C. P. Bulletin is set forth, and to the break-down of available funds by States on pages 923 and 924 of the 1945 hearings.

We had anticipated that all States would live within their allocation, but in the Southern States and in one or two other States, a greater number of farmers participated in the program and carried out more conservation practices than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was not that foreseen?

Mr. DODD. There was no way for us, Mr. CANNON, to foresee it. We have to use past participation in the program as the basis of estimating what the participation will be in any given year, and since we had an even larger program for 1944 than in any other year, it was anticipated that those States would be well within it. The 1944 program was the first program the total emphasis of which was placed on conservation practices, making it extremely difficult to estimate participation.

The CHAIRMAN. In making your agreements with the farmers, or in making your announcements to the farmers, did you indicate that in the event of the appropriation being insufficient to meet the situation that they would be paid pro rata?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir; that the cuts would be made in rates.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we are not under any contract to pay.

DIFFICULTY OF ESTIMATING PARTICIPATION

Mr. JUMP. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize two points.

One of them is the question as to why we could not estimate the participation more

accurately. This is the first year we have had conservation payments without production adjustment payments, and while we made what we thought would be adequate allowance for increased participation, because we knew there would be some increase in conservation practices, we were very much surprised at the amount of the increased participation in the conservation program when it was the only program carried on. That is one point.

CHOICE BETWEEN INCREASING THE FUND AND REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS BELOW AMOUNTS ANNOUNCED

The second point is that we are not asking for an additional appropriation. The question that we are really submitting for decision is whether or not Congress would prefer to consider raising the limitation in the 1944 Appropriation Act, which prevents us from spending more than \$300,000,000 on the program, or whether we should reduce the payments below the announced rates in the areas where actual participation considerably exceeded our estimates. Neither Congress nor the Department, without some experience, could make as good an estimate of participation on this first year as they could after some experience.

The CHAIRMAN. There would be no requirement for additional funds?

Mr. JUMP. No, sir; this is just a change of limitation.

Mr. DODD. That is right; but if the limitation of \$300,000,000 is raised it would involve, of course, a reduction in funds in subsequent programs to those areas where we have overpaid this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Will there be a surplus in the appropriation of some of the States where those funds may be used to meet this deficit?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see why that adjustment should not be made.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will this be the amount required, \$313,000,000?

Mr. DODD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUDLOW. The elements in that situation do not indicate that this will continue to grow?

Mr. DODD. No; I think this is the best estimate that it will be possible for us to make until we have made the last payment.

Mr. TABER. What is in Mr. Ludlow's mind is next year will it not be bigger, and the year after will it not be bigger than ever?

Mr. DODD. I doubt that very much, particularly since four regions were able to estimate their participation in the 1944 program so close that they do not need any more funds.

Mr. LUDLOW. Are you taking precautions so that this situation will not recur?

Mr. DODD. As far as we are concerned we could stop this now by making substantial reductions in payments in the States that are over. However, since the 1944 program is the first program limited to conservation practices only, and in view of the unprecedented participation therein, it was thought that the Congress might desire to consider adjusting the limitation on the 1944 program rather than have reductions made in rates of payment covering practices already carried out and earned at announced rates when no increase in appropriation was involved.

Mr. JUMP. We have taken the precaution that when overparticipation of this kind does occur we can reduce the rates of payment. In the normal situation that would be possible without any difficulty. But here you have two regions, the southern and the western, where they went so far over the estimated participation, and we would have to cut the rates so sharply in those areas, that we thought Congress should be advised of the situation.

Mr. LUDLOW. That was a dire penalty that was suggested by the chairman, and we would not want to see you penalized that way.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS BY REGIONS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Dodd, you apportion these funds, after they are appropriated, between the different areas in the United States?

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. Between how many different areas?

Mr. DODD. Five different areas, but it is built up first on a State to State basis.

Mr. TARVER. What is the basis of apportionment?

Mr. DODD. While no production adjustment payments were provided in the 1944 program, the available funds were apportioned to the States in the same general way as distributed under previous programs in accordance with section 15 of the act of February 29, 1936, as amended.

Mr. TARVER. So that where you have apportioned to a particular area a certain sum of money, and one State in that area does not use all of the money apportioned to it, but another State in that area uses more than the amount of money apportioned to it, you can take the surplus from the State which has not used all of its money and use that surplus to pay up the claims in the State where the farmers have participated to a greater extent than had been estimated?

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

MISSOURI AND GEORGIA APPORTIONMENTS COMPARED

Mr. TARVER. For example, in the State of Missouri, Mr. Dodd, the farmers earned 18 percent more than had been allotted to that State.

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. And yet the State of Missouri was located in a region where other States had not utilized all of their funds, so that it was possible to get funds from the amounts apportioned to the other States and pay Missouri farmers in full, notwithstanding the fact that they exceeded by 18 percent the amount of money allocated to them.

Mr. DODD. Iowa earned 82 percent, and Missouri earned 118 percent, so that the two of them would balance.

Mr. TARVER. But another State, the State of Georgia, which has also earned 18 percent more than the amount allotted to it, cannot have its farmers paid in full by reason of the fact that there are no other States in the same region which have failed to utilize the total of the funds allocated to them.

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. So that under the existing situation, unless remedied, the State of Missouri's farmers who have exceeded their apportionment by exactly the same percentage as those in the State of Georgia, would be paid in full, and those in the State of Georgia would be reduced.

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

The amount of increase in conservation practices is a most amazing thing, not only in the southern region, but in all other regions, although the southern region did make a bigger percentage of increase this year than in any other year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Although they were short of labor they produced a whole lot more than had been anticipated. Of course, the rain did not have anything to do with it?

Mr. DODD. I think it did.

Mr. TABER. Was the rain the reason these folks earned more money?

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. TABER. What was the reason?

Mr. DODD. We have had an educational campaign on down there for many years, for better use of land, more terracing and more winter cover crops, to put that land under protection in the winter.

Mr. TABER. Some of these people found it more profitable to indulge in these practices than to raise crops?

Mr. DODD. No; if they had not used these practices they could not have raised the crops they did, Mr. TABER.

Mr. TABER. Well, maybe they could have.

Mr. DODD. I believe not.

Mr. TARVER. These are the practices which have enabled them to increase production.

Mr. DODD. That is right. If you plant legumes, and the next spring you plow under a big growth of leguminous matter you have a much better chance of raising a good crop in the spring. The same thing is true of your big terracing program in the South.

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING BY FARMERS THAT ANNOUNCED PAYMENTS MAY BE REDUCED

Mr. TARVER. Of course, you pointed out that in this contract, that requires a lawyer to understand it thoroughly, you have a provision by which, in case Congress does not appropriate adequate funds, or they are not made available, that you can cut down the amount of benefits which you have promised the farmers. As a matter of fact, 99 percent of the farmers do not understand that there is any chance of their benefits being reduced below the amount estimated at the time of the execution of their farm plans.

Mr. DODD. I do not know what the percentage is, but most of them do not so understand.

Mr. TARVER. And if in the carrying out of the soil-conservation practices according to their plan they are to be paid only 80 percent of what has been promised to them there would be great disappointment, and, perhaps, a lack of cooperation in the program hereafter.

Mr. DODD. Yes, there would be a reduction in participation in the program in the years that are to come.

EXTRACT FROM COMMITTEE REPORT ON FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945 CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The committee has passed over without prejudice a Budget proposal to increase from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000 the limitation upon expenditures contained in the 1944 Agricultural Appropriation Act for effecting payments at announced rates for compliance with the 1944 programs of soil building and soil- and water-conservation practices.

Increased participation, not anticipated when funds were allocated, has brought about a situation where payment of the announced rates cannot be made to many participants. This would extend to all farmers in the southern region, and, to a lesser extent, to farmers in the western region.

More is involved than the inequity pointed out. There should be some change in procedure to avoid a repetition thereof, and, possibly, to control the measure of participation. These are questions which the committee did not have the time properly to consider. The whole subject can be thoroughly canvassed by the regular subcommittee later and provision then made to increase payments to those farmers who now cannot be paid in full the announced rates for participation in the 1944 program.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I would prefer to wait until I have completed my presentation of the matter, at which time I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The Budget estimate in question does not involve the appropriation of any additional funds by the Congress. However, it involves the granting of authority to the Department of Agriculture and the

Agricultural Adjustment Administration to utilize funds which have already been appropriated in the 1945 Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, in order to discharge obligations of the Government to farmers. In some States the farmers have carried on soil- and water-conservation practices by which they have earned as much as 18 percent in excess of the funds which have been allocated by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for use in those States. Some States, such as the State of Missouri, from which the chairman of this subcommittee comes, are in a more fortunate situation than States such as my own State of Georgia, by reason of the fact that these funds have been allocated to regions—to five different regions in the United States. Whenever in a region one State has exceeded the funds which were allocated to that State, and there are other States in the region which have failed to earn the amount of funds allocated to them, the funds may be taken from the States which have failed to make use of their funds used to pay the obligations of the Government in those States which have exceeded the amounts of their allocations.

That is the fortunate situation of the farmers in the gentleman's State of Missouri. Those farmers exceeded the amount of funds allocated to Missouri by 18 percent, but one State in that region, the State of Iowa, failed by 18 percent to utilize the funds allocated to that State. So the farmers in the State of Missouri, although they exceeded the estimates for that State by 18 percent, may be paid and will be paid in full.

However, in my own State of Georgia, which is only an example of States which are similarly situated, the farmers also exceeded by 18 percent earning the amount of funds allocated to that State. But Georgia happens to be situated in a region where other States in that region made use of all the funds allocated to them, and therefore there are no surplus funds recoverable from the other States in the region which can be utilized to pay the claims of the Georgia farmers. So while they are in exactly the same situation as the farmers in Missouri, having earned more than 18 percent in excess of the amount of funds allocated to the State, under the situation as it exists, and unless corrected, the farmers in the State of Missouri will be paid in full, but the farmers in the State of Georgia will have their payments reduced by approximately 20 percent.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. What the gentleman has said is true. Some of the Members may not appreciate the importance of this matter, because they have not yet heard from the farmers, because the farmers do not yet know what the situation is that confronts them.

Mr. TARVER. The farmer takes it for granted that the Government is going to keep its promise.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. He assumes that the Government will pay its promise, 100 cents on the dollar. The

State of Texas is one of those States which is going to be discounted 18 percent, and the farmers, instead of getting the 100 percent promised, are going to get a reduction of 18 percent.

Mr. TARVER. Now, it is true, there is incorporated in the contract between the Government and the farmer a provision to the effect that if the Congress fails to make available sufficient funds with which to meet the obligations of the Government, the farmer must anticipate a reduction of his benefits in proportion.

But that is not a thing which has been impressed upon the farmers of the country when the Government has promised them so much for carrying on conservation practices, terracing, planting legumes, lespedeza, and carrying out other practices which have occasioned the expenditure of considerable amounts of funds, and cooperation of farmers has been more than anticipated. The Government should pay them. They have fulfilled their part of the contract.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. But with his permission, let me say, first, that there are sufficient funds to discharge this obligation. The trouble arises by reason of a limitation placed in the 1944 Agricultural Appropriation Act limiting to \$300,000,000 amounts which could be expended in the program for 1944, the over-all expenditures. If you will examine the hearings, on page 529 and following, you will find that the budget officer of the Department of Agriculture testified that no additional money is necessary. What they desire is to have authority to take funds which have been allocated to the fertilizer, seed, and materials program, that is the program for the furnishing of seed, fertilizer, and materials to farmers during the years 1945 and 1946 as advances and which will not be needed for those purposes, and use them to discharge in full these obligations which have been assumed to the farmers of the various States which have participated in this program to a far greater degree than was anticipated and who, on that account, have earned more money than it had been expected would be earned in those States.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like for the gentleman from Georgia to emphasize that this is not a sectional matter applying only to the South. All the Southern States have overearned except Florida, and of the Western States the following: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming have also overearned to a greater extent than many of the Southern States.

Mr. TARVER. And the State of Missouri.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; we can also point this out, that even in States like Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Virginia, these payments have been overearned but by reason of the fact that some of the States in those areas

have underearned, most of this burden will fall on the South and the West.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is exactly correct.

I have undertaken to point out that unless corrected it will result in the most unreasonable and unjust discrimination against farmers in the States who have cooperated most actively in the soil- and water-conservation programs. They will not receive the amounts which the Government has promised them; whereas in other areas where the farmers also have cooperated to a greater extent than had been anticipated because of their regional situation and the availability of funds from other States which did not use all of the funds allocated to them, the farmers will be paid in full. The effect will be that the Congress of the United States will pay some at the expense of others. The Government's promise to these farmers should be carried out.

Now, they say that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration ought not to have been mistaken in the estimates which it made as the basis for this program in 1944. This is the first year in which they have carried on a purely soil- and water-conservation program. Heretofore we have had a crop-adjustment program as well. This year they did underestimate the participation of the farmers in some areas, but they have promised in the future to endeavor to correct their estimates so as to come within the amounts made available for these purposes by Congress. But now the situation simply is that if anybody made a mistake it was the administrative officials of the Government, not the farmers; and good faith with the farmers requires that the Government meet its obligation to them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand the situation, the Government underestimated the amount that would be required to carry out this program, but the farmers were invited to participate in this program.

Mr. TARVER. And promised certain amounts for carrying out certain things.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And acting upon that invitation to participate the farmers went out and in good faith cooperated and participated in this program, a thing that the country has been trying to get them to do all the way along.

Mr. TARVER. That is true; and if the Government fails to meet its obligation it will do more to destroy the program, in my judgment, than any one thing. Whenever a farmer becomes convinced that the promises of the Government are not going to be kept, he is not going to be as enthusiastic about cooperating in any program as he has been heretofore.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If we do not provide the funds to carry out this invitation of the Government to participate, it will be cause for the farmers of this country to cease to respect the obligations that the Government has indulged in.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. If any corporation should have a contract with an agency of the Government and it should be set aside as illegal on account of an agent of the Government having exceeded his authority, your Claims Committee would bring in a bill for its relief, and it has done so in thousands of cases. If anybody exceeded his authority in the Department of Agriculture it should not be charged up to the farmers of the country who have incurred expense in endeavoring to go along with this program which they were invited to join.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The same situation exists in my own State of Arkansas where the farmers have already earned an amount in excess of that which has been allocated to the State. It is not taking money into our State to pay them for something they will do in the future but for that which they have already earned.

Mr. TARVER. Yes; and if you will examine the report of the committee you will find the committee said it passed this over without prejudice to the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield me more time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no time left.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to call attention to one fact. Many of these States—Texas is one—have for a number of years failed to use the amount of money allocated to them. In each instance that money has been allocated to other States. Now, then, beginning this year with the limitation that is now imposed, when a State like Texas, and I presume like the gentleman's State of Georgia, finds it has used all of the money allocated to it, we find even though our average over 5 years has been less than the amount allocated, we are not to be paid the full amount.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is quite correct. There is one statement I must make within the time allotted me. The reason assigned by the subcommittee for passing the buck to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations was that this committee did not have sufficient time to investigate the matter. It did have hearings which appear to be full and complete.

The regular Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1946 will not probably be passed until the latter part of June 1945. These soil-conservation checks are going to be sent out in the early part of 1945. If you do not act on it now you are going to be in the attitude of having the payments to these farmers reduced by about

20 percent, the first payments, and if the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee makes provision in the regular bill for completing the payments, of having additional checks for the last 20 percent sent out to the same hundreds of thousands of farmers throughout the country later on in the year, thus doubling the administrative expense and at the same time interfering with participation in the program for the year 1945.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia if there is not a tendency now, when the allocation under this appropriation is made to the several States, each State realizing that unless it spends the money it will lose the funds at the end of the fiscal year, to make other commitments for all the money that has been allocated, and that that has a tendency to cause more money to be spent than actually is appropriated.

Mr. TARVER. No. I do not think, may I say to my colleague, that that observation is soundly based. I think the Department of Agriculture made estimates as to the expected participation in this program by the farmers of the different States, which were inaccurate estimates, but they went to the farmers and offered them certain sums for following certain practices, and the farmers participated in this very fine program to a far greater extent than was anticipated, thereby earning more money than was expected, and the Department, from the allocated funds, is without means to discharge its obligations.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. May I ask the gentleman if he proposes to offer an amendment to cure this?

Mr. TARVER. I do. Of course, there is some question as to whether or not the amendment will be in order under the rules, but I intend to offer one amendment which, if it should not be held in order, I will supplement by offering another dealing with that situation in the hope that the House will take action to remedy what would otherwise be a very grave injustice.

Mr. FOLGER. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know whether my State is affected but I am going to vote for his amendment because I think it is eminently fair and right.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia. With reference to the item discussed by the gentleman from Georgia, I note that in the hearings the chairman asked this question of Mr. Jump, the budget officer for the Department of Agriculture:

The CHAIRMAN. There would be no requirement for additional funds?

Mr. JUMP. No, sir; this is just a change of limitation.

Mr. DONN. That is right, but if the limitation of \$300,000,000 is raised it would involve, of course, a reduction in funds in subsequent programs to those areas where we have overpaid this year.

Does that mean that a reduction would be made next year in the amount that was advanced to take up the contracts for this year?

Mr. TARVER. As I understand the evidence it is to the effect that the funds needed for completing this year's program would be taken from funds which had been allocated under the materials program to be advanced to farmers on account of the 1945 and 1946 farm operations, and that it would not involve reductions in any way of payments which may be provided by Congress for the 1945 soil and water conservation programs. Those funds have not yet been appropriated.

Mr. CASE. Let me put the question in another way. If this does not involve any additional money, what farmers then will supply the \$13,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. No farmers. It will be supplied from the funds which are not needed for the fertilizer, seed, and other agricultural materials program. The making available of this money to pay these obligations of the Government would not be decreasing the amounts of any benefits pledged to any farmers by 1 cent.

Mr. CASE. It would use \$13,000,000 that would revert to the Treasury from another fund?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. CASE. What was the reason for making this allocation by regions? Why was it not prorated over the whole United States?

Mr. TARVER. It was the duty of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency to apportion equitably the amount as between the different regions of the country, taking into consideration their needs for soil conservation and probable or anticipated participation of their farmers in the program which had been projected. They simply made an error in the allocation of the funds. The law does not, in my judgment, require the allocation of the funds between regions, but it permits it, and that allocation has been made.

Mr. CASE. Is it true, then, that if the funds had not been allocated by regions the thing would automatically have taken care of itself and the reduction would automatically have been adjusted over the entire United States?

Mr. TARVER. That may possibly be true, but the fact remains that it has been allocated by regions and that the result will ensue which I outlined a while ago, that in some States which have exceeded their quota by as much as my own State of Georgia the farmers will be paid in full, whereas in my State and many other States farmers who have exceeded their quotas by the same or similar percentages will not be paid in full, which I think the gentleman will agree with me is a very substantial injustice.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think the gentleman from South Dakota has put his finger on the very heart of this matter. The truth of the situation is that certain States, because of favorable allocations, are being taken care of in full, but States like Louisiana, where they have cooperated in the war effort in response to appeals from the War Food Administrator, are going to be penalized badly. There is nothing in the law whatever that states that the Department of Agriculture shall be allowed to withhold funds from one region and give those funds to another region. If you took this matter into court, of course, you would tie up every agricultural payment in this country. It makes it very difficult on those people who do not enjoy the situation. I think the gentleman put his finger on it when he asked by what authority they allocated these things by regions.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that the Department has traditionally apportioned these funds out to the States by regions. In previous years the payments have been based on commodities, like so much per pound of cotton, and on soil conservation. This is the first year that the complete payment was based on soil conservation. Even as between the areas, though, we could not solve the problem, because the law specifically prohibits the expenditure of more than \$300,000,000 on this program in any one year, whereas \$313,000,000 is needed this year. That is the reason it is absolutely essential to get this amendment adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. This is exactly what I had in mind a while ago when I asked the gentleman from Georgia a question. I voted for this amendment in the committee, and I am in favor of its adoption on the floor of the House, but I do believe that the method of allocation ought to be changed.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me something ought to be done about the method of allocation. I have considerable sympathy for the farmer who in good faith engaged in the practices and went to the expense of compliance in anticipation of getting a certain payment, but it seems to me there ought to be some way of stopping the Department of Agriculture officials from allocating by regions and engaging in a representation or practice that gets us into this kind of a jackpot.

Mr. NORRELL. The money could remain to the credit of the State until it was used by the State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an appropriate time to bring up a question that has caused me considerable concern in the last 2 or 3 years. That is the matter of the fiscal policy of the Congress. I think this is especially true since we have so much agitation for more experts for the various committees. The thought that I will try to leave here today is this, and I will give an example later of what I mean. I realize that the Committee on Appropriations work very hard. They are a group of splendid men, as is every other committee, and for every one of which I have a high regard. I know the hours that they put in on the hearings and hearing justifications for appropriations. I have followed them rather closely as I presume each and every one of us has, especially those that have a Member from their State on the committee. I will say that the Member from Wisconsin on the Committee on Appropriations has been very helpful to the other Members of the Wisconsin delegation, advising them as to exactly what is taking place in the Committee on Appropriations. But it seems that during the last 2 or 3 years we have another kind of Committee on Appropriations. I have not been able to exactly figure out how it functions and how it works. I am referring to the Committee on Banking and Currency. While it is necessary to go to the regular Committee on Appropriations with all the justifications and so forth, it seems that through the Committee on Banking and Currency we make funds available, public funds, that seem to be handled in a much different way than they are handled when they go through the Committee on Appropriations. I will just give this one example I referred to before. You all remember when we had the Cannon amendment up here, to appropriate funds for incentive payments. Now, I happened to be one of the 90 who voted in favor of incentive payments, so that I have not any personal sore spot as a result of that. However, the Congress expressed itself and voted it down. But it was only shortly after that, through the Committee on Banking and Currency, we had legislation that provided several millions of dollars for doing this same thing on which the Congress supported the Committee on Appropriations in their contention, and would not appropriate money for the purpose. The reason I bring it up at this time is because, according to the press, we are soon to be faced with a more extensive use of public funds, whereby we are going to be required or are going to be asked, either through the Committee on Appropriations or by some other device like the C. C. C., to issue debentures or some other way through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and provide some \$2,000,000 for exporting agricultural surpluses. I wish someone who is familiar with the fiscal policy of

this administration would try to coordinate these activities so that at least the members of the Committee on Appropriations will not ask me where these C. C. Corporation people get the money to carry on their activities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are two items of appropriation in this bill which are based on the authorization in the so-called Lanham Act with reference to defense community facilities and with reference to wartime housing. In my judgment, they are inadequate to meet the situation which confronts us in the prosecution of this war, and I hope they will be reinforced by further appropriation under the authorization mentioned.

The time of the end of this war cannot be definitely foreseen or determined. The purposes for which this legislation was enacted remain an important consideration and will continue to engage our attention until the end of this war. The call is now being made for increased production in several phases of our program, and it behooves us to do what is necessary to assure the manufacture and delivery of all necessary supplies to our armed forces.

It is worthy of note in this connection that in the construction of our various war plants practically all of the necessary funds have come from the Public Treasury. On the contrary, in the carrying out of the necessary wartime housing and facilities for the immigrant workers to make those plants operative, a very great part of the funds has come from private capital and through private enterprise. It must be borne in mind that the Lanham Act is a war emergency measure which is in no way intended to limit or restrict private enterprise in the fields in which it can operate advantageously under the existing war conditions.

In terms of the total war-housing program, the reliance which has been placed upon the initiative, capital resources, and productive capacity of private enterprise to supply by far the larger part of the necessary war housing is evident. Of the total war-housing program of 3,964,764 units, 79 percent—3,138,545 units—is being supplied by private enterprise and private capital, while 21 percent—826,219 units—is being supplied with public funds. The 79 percent—3,138,545 units—of the total war-housing program being supplied by private enterprise and private capital is made up as follows: 53 percent—2,094,000 units—through the use of existing private structures, 5 percent—209,182 units—through conversions of existing structures, and 21 percent—835,363 units—through new construction of permanent family dwelling units. By far the greater part of these permanent units has come through the terms and provisions of the F. H. A. legislation. Of the 826,219 units—21 percent—of the total war-housing program supplied with public funds, more than 75 percent are trailers, portable units, dormitories, and temporary family dwelling units which, under the express terms of the Lanham Act, are required to be removed after the war.

Of course, there has been criticism of some of the particular projects, and that is natural in an undertaking of such colossal magnitude, but I think the figures I have recited reflect very creditable administration of the housing feature of this act.

The community facilities have been an essential and a vital part of the administration of this act, and our record of production for war purposes is largely due to this feature of this legislation. The success of the plants must depend upon the morale of the workers. The reports which have come to me of the impetus which has been given our effort through the community facilities which have been provided are indeed gratifying. The strength of America is its family life. Immigrant workers naturally realize that the temporary construction which has been made available and such community facilities as have been reasonably possible and practical do not always afford all the comforts of home, but the difficult job has been accomplished in such an acceptable way that the workers have gone about their daily tasks with relative freedom from worry and care.

This emergency act was absolutely essential to the prosecution of our war program, and what is necessary to keep it effective until the victory is won is a matter of the utmost importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in granting me this time, because I want an opportunity to discuss this matter of these A. A. A. payments with you for a minute or two.

I think the great difficulty is that the money is not being spread around evenly, and that if the money was spread around evenly over the whole country, this complaint would quickly disappear.

It requires \$313,000,000 to meet the A. A. A. payments nationally this year. The Congress appropriated \$300,000,000. You may ask why the money was not sufficient to go around. The simple answer is that every year there have been sufficient farmers who did not meet their quotas so that these lapses from parts of the State or the regions would take care of those who overearned. Every year there has been money turned back to the Federal Treasury. This is the first year that has not been true. Why is this the first year? Because there have been unusual pressures put upon the farmers asking them to give to the Government correct crop practices which will produce the world's record supply of food. It is only because the farmer has patriotically tried to meet what his local war-food committees have asked him to do that he is in trouble today. Every State in the southern region is in trouble, with the one exception of the State of Florida. For instance, a State like Louisiana had a quota of \$3,606,000, but the farmers have earned \$5,019,000, or 166 percent.

They should not be penalized for doing a patriotic job. Members of the Louisiana delegation have protested a reduction of their triple A payments. One of them, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], has just been showing me some of his files bearing on that subject. That reduction is what this Congress is about to make necessary. If the Department of Agriculture would cut everybody down equally it would only take a Nation-wide reduction of about 4 percent, but because the Department is not cutting everybody down, one certain farmer in one certain State may face a penalty running as high as 40 percent. On this point, in the State of Mississippi the quota was \$5,253,000 but the farmers patriotically have already earned \$7,582,000 or 144 percent of what was allowed to them.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. And when it comes to telling these farmers that they have actually got to pay back into the fund it is going to raise considerable trouble. I think the whole situation is improper and unjust and I am going to vote for the Tarver amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The farmers will not understand it when they are given a check which is not for the full amount of what is due them, but is 40 percent less than that. In the State of Texas they had an allotment of \$19,215,000, but on a patriotic basis they have earned \$24,843,000, or 129 percent.

The whole of the Western States as a group are entitled to \$46,000,000. They need \$48,000,000; and those farmers out there are facing the same problems faced by farmers in the South. The answer is that when the farmer has complied with his part of the contract the Government should comply with its part. Take the case of a contractor. Would we treat a contractor this way? A contractor making tanks, we will say, who has done a superlative job under his contract and carried it out to and beyond the letter, would we go to him and say we could pay him for only a lesser number of tanks? The money is there to pay these farmers. Every year, for year after year after year, money has been turned back from this fund to the Treasury, and here for the first time under the stimulation of war the farmer has come through with the things the Government wanted him to do. And now somebody says we cannot pay him. The farmers in an area that has earned \$19,000,000 are to be paid \$13,000,000. That is to be done by chiseling \$25, \$50, or \$100 from each of the farmers in that area. I say it is wrong. It is going to do more to destroy the whole system of A. A. A. payments than anything else you could do.

By coincidence, there are other sections of the country that are going to come out all right. The North Central region has \$75,460,000 allotted to it. They need only \$74,769,000. The Northwest region has \$15,974,000; the farmers will earn only \$15,712,000. So those farmers are not going to be penalized.

When you penalize one section of the country and do not penalize the other, then you do have injustice, and then you do have complaints, and then you do have trouble when you face those farmers and try to explain it to them. I say to you, this thing is absolutely wrong, and we are just making a mistake if we go ahead and do not correct it by adopting the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, will offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the newspapers and also in the magazines recently we have noticed a disposition to approve the proposition that Congressmen should provide themselves with additional assistants so that they will be able to serve their constituents promptly and adequately. It is not quite accurate to say that we need help, that is, that Members of Congress need help. If we are given additional money for clerk hire—for the employment of another assistant in the office—the benefit is not to the Congressman but to the people of the district he represents.

One of the most severe of my critics has charged that I devoted too much of my time to answering the letters of the people of my district. He said I spent too much time trying to get priorities for some farmer who wanted either a tire or gasoline or some farm tool in order to carry on production. He said that what I should do was to devote my efforts to curing the cause that brought forth the complaint.

I presume he meant what I should do was to repeal the legislation, like that which created the O. P. A. or the War Labor Board or any of those Federal agencies—which gave the opportunity to some agency to impose an unjust restriction. Well, that was all right, but I told him I was only 1 of 435 Members of the House and that for some reason or other, I did not know why, the majority would not listen to me to the extent of following my suggestion and that I could not remove those causes, the legislation that brought about the complaints. I told him I could not repeal all of those laws which enabled the various boards to make the orders.

Then, too, he suggested that I spent too much time answering the blood relatives of those who were in the service, the mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, brothers and sisters, who wrote me or wired me or called me over the phone wanting to know something about insurance, something with reference to the whereabouts, something about the condition of a loved one who was in the service of his country.

This critic made another complaint. I do not know whether he wanted me to end the war or win the war or what he did want me to do. But he said I was wasting my time with the individual citizens of my district. Back here a moment ago on the floor I was talking to one of my Republican brethren for whom I have the greatest respect, although I do not agree with him on much of anything

except perhaps that he ought to be here as a Representative. He said, "You should not have your people writing you so many letters." The substance of his argument was that I was to blame because I had tried to extend help to those who called upon me for assistance as, for instance, last night when I received two long-distance telephone calls. One was about a passport for someone going down into South America to see a relative in the service, and the other wanting to know the whereabouts of a soldier who had been returned from abroad wounded and who was to report to The Pentagon. The family had moved and they did not want the boy to go to his old home. They wanted him to come directly to the new home.

I ask you, what should a Congressman do? Should I tell him it is not any of my business, "You will have to look it up yourself, call up somebody and find out"?

Now, this Republican friend of mine is a fine gentleman and I love him for his learning, his ability, and all that, but he said to me, "You are thinking too much about little things." He did not say so, but I gathered by implication that he was thinking, "You ought to be a statesman." He did not say that. He thought it. I said, "Now, listen, while you are thinking of all your foreign constituents, all these folks that come under U. N. R. R. A. over across the seas, while you are worried about whether they shall get a tractor, cultivator, clothing, food, or something else, I am compelled to think of the folks here at home first."

I cannot answer the letters, and I know there are other Members in this House who cannot answer the letters, and the phone calls and the wires they get from their constituents. Try to aid all here at home who are in trouble because of some administrative order without additional assistance. As the days go on, more and more boys will return from abroad and more of their relatives and the boys themselves will be seeking our aid. I ask you in all candor, is there anyone who is more entitled to the service of his Representative in Congress than those boys and their relatives? As far as I am concerned, I am going to pay attention first to the people back home, to the needs of the people who hired me, to the needs and the welfare of the people whom I represent. Upon their welfare depends the welfare of the Nation as a whole and incidentally the well-being of the world as a whole.

A number of gentlemen on the minority side have said, "Oh, well; we don't need extra." All right; if they do not need another clerk they do not have to employ one. They do not have to collect the money. They can just let it stay in the Federal Treasury. But as for me—and I know the majority of the Members, on both sides, feel the same way—two-thirds need this additional help in order, in the days to come, they may adequately serve their constituents. While we are providing practically all of the money that is asked for by the executive department, the Judicial Department and all of the other departments, we stint ourselves

and make it impossible to do the jobs some of us would like to do.

Let me ask you one more question and I am through. Why do we do it? Is it because—and I am not insinuating that it is—but is it because we fear that some one will vote against us in the coming election if we venture to give ourselves a part of the assistance which so many of us know we need?

I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. We heard the Speaker here today make a statement on the floor which indicates to me that those two gentlemen—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN]—and they ought to know if anybody does know, and they do know—that those two gentlemen are in favor of this proposition to give us at least some of the help we should have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, for the past 12 years, particularly for the past 5 or 6 years preceding the war, there has been a very great deal of general talk about freedom of speech and freedom of press. These discussions have been more or less academic. Unfortunately, it has been assumed by most people that while freedom of speech and freedom of press have been suppressed in other countries it could not happen here. The sinister fact is, Mr. Speaker, it is happening here, and the fact that it is happening here is definitely a sinister threat to all the liberties of our people, to our constitutional form of government, to our free enterprise system, and to our free society.

Most of our people have been accustomed to associating the destruction of freedom of speech and press with the known activities of bright-eyed, long-haired apostles of radicalism or some bewhiskered dictator wearing boots and carrying a whip. But the fact is there are many ways in which to destroy freedom of speech and freedom of press, and many of those ways are at work, mostly under cover, in this Nation right now.

Newspapers which can be terrorized by union racketeers—and I want it distinctly understood that I mean only racketeers and not legitimate patriotic union leaders who give thought only to the genuine welfare of their followers—may be compelled, through sheer necessity of self-preservation, to alter their editorial policies, or to avoid printing facts which the people ought to be permitted to know.

The power of the bureaus in the executive department of the Government has grown to such a vast extent that the newspaper correspondent in Washington who incurs the displeasure of the administration may find himself confronted with tremendous difficulties in getting news which can be and is made easily accessible to those correspondents who will carry administration propaganda or who are in favor with the bureaucrats.

Another method by which the freedom of the press can be destroyed is by pres-

sure from big advertisers who can be organized and can bluntly serve notice on whole blocks of newspapers or magazines that if they do not alter their editorial policies and practices to suit the administration, hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars' worth of advertising can and will be summarily canceled out of their columns.

So then, freedom of speech and freedom of press are not safe in America merely because there is not as yet any bewhiskered dictator issuing orders under which suppression of free speech and a free press is accomplished.

I am reminded of a warning once issued to the Nation by Dorothy Thompson, the columnist. Let me quote her observations in the New York Herald Tribune on February 17, 1937, when she was seeing clearly the trend of affairs. Said Miss Thompson then:

No people ever recognize their dictator in advance. He never stands for election on the platform of dictatorship. He always represents himself as the instrument for expressing the incorporated national will. When Americans think of dictators they always think of some foreign model. If anyone turned up here in a fur hat, boots, and a grim look, he would be recognized and shunned. Likewise anyone resembling six Roman emperors; or someone you must greet with a stiff arm and a "Hell." But when our dictator turns up, you can depend on it that he will be one of the boys, and he will stand for everything traditionally American. Since the great American tradition is freedom and democracy, you can bet that our dictator—God help us—will be a great democrat, through whose leadership alone democracy can be realized.

We are failing to recognize the destruction of free speech and a free press as it creeps upon us.

From time to time incidents arise which show to where we are drifting, and nowhere is it more clearly shown than on the radio. Radio commentators combine in themselves both the rights of free press and free speech. Presumably the air belongs to the American people. Presumably the wavelengths belong to the American people. Presumably no administration, no party, or no group has a right to preempt the airways and say they will control the spoken word or the music which goes out over those airways. Mr. Caesar Petrillo does control the music that goes out over the airways, and he has defied both the President of the United States and the War Labor Board in order to do it. He seems to have gotten away with it. But, on the other side, we must look at the case of the well-known commentator, Boake Carter, recently deceased, who was driven from the air because the administration, or somebody in the administration, did not like his broadcasts.

The latest case and the one I will discuss today, Mr. Chairman, is that of Upton Close, veteran radio news commentator and analyst of public affairs, who has been driven off the air by the National Broadcasting Co. because, so Close asserts—and I believe his assertions—certain radical communistic elements found his broadcasts to be objectionable because he was warning the Nation of the danger of communism in America.

The brief facts are that the National Broadcasting Co. served notice on Mr. Close's radio sponsor, the Shaeffer Pen Co., that "it no longer will sell its time on the air" if Close was not dropped.

Close has stated unequivocally that certain radical and communistic elements were responsible for the action of the National Broadcasting Co. He was found objectionable, he said, because of his discussion of the danger of communism during the Sunday afternoon commentaries he has been broadcasting for 27 months. In Fort Madison, Iowa, the home of the Shaeffer Pen Co., C. R. Shaeffer, president, said:

N. B. C. notified us it wouldn't sell Close after December 10. We aren't in a position to state the reasons, because we don't know them. (Washington Times-Herald, November 15, 1944.)

From the main offices of the radio chain in New York there was the terse statement that N. B. C. "had no comment on the matter."

Close has explained to the public that his contract is with the National Broadcasting Co. and that the network contracted to sell his services to the pen company, which has sponsored his Sunday program during the more than 2 years it has been on the air. Close revealed that this has been a most unusual procedure. Said he:

I have been with N. B. C. 4 years and it has been my sales agent, but while it is supposed to be selling me, it proceeds to unsell me to my sponsor without consulting or notifying me. So far as notice to me is concerned, N. B. C. is still my agent.

My program had a top Sunday rating, an audience of about 9,000,000 listeners, and N. B. C. had so advertised it. Only 2 weeks ago my contract was renewed for 52 weeks with, incidentally, a raise in pay. The fact that N. B. C. would jeopardize one of its top programs indicates the pressure and the importance of this matter to the Nation.

I am perfectly willing to be a guinea pig to determine whether freedom of the air can be maintained in the face of un-American pressure to destroy American principles.

Incidentally, N. B. C. has censored and approved every script I've used in my broadcasts.

Evidently what Mr. Close said over that station was not offensive to N. B. C. It is pertinent to ask at this point who it is that it was offensive to and who is powerful enough to compel N. B. C. to repudiate the man with whom it had just renewed a contract and to whom that company had just given a raise in salary. The individual or individuals who issued the orders to N. B. C. must be powerful indeed with the present administration.

Mr. Close continues:

It seems to me my sponsor was most improperly and unpleasantly put in the middle in this matter and that N. B. C. took a most injudicious method of compromising the situation.

But more important than my personal fortunes is whether these pressure groups can establish such control over opinions. If they can, then we are in the midst of totalitarianism.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with every part of that statement. If such pressure groups can drive men like Upton Close from the airways, we are, indeed, in the midst of totalitarianism.

I want to say to you, sir, that even though someone may rise and say the American people in the last election chose that kind of government, there are 22,000,000 voters who did not want that kind of government, who do not want that kind of government, and who do not intend to accept that kind of government if they can avoid it, and it is those more than 22,000,000 people for whom I speak here today.

The very evidence that such a terrorism is in effect over the air waves of America is to be found in the fact that every broadcasting company, big and little, in this Nation, must go back to the Federal Communications Commission every 6 months, hat in hand, humbly to seek a renewal of its license. This means that this arbitrary Commission—and there is no question but that the F. C. C. has been arbitrary—could deny any broadcasting company in this Nation its license and in 2 weeks' time ruin it by putting it off the air even temporarily.

Mr. Chairman, this is altogether too much power. It is too dangerous a power to be vested in any board which has shown the disposition toward an independent radio that the present Federal Communications Commission has shown.

Within the last few days, a committee of Congress has heard testimony that the owner of a station on a Nation-wide network was compelled, through a conspiracy in which some highly placed confidants of the administration were involved, to sell his station at something like a half million dollars less than it was worth.

Strangely enough this same committee, after "jumping the rabbit" for some unexplained reason, suddenly decided to call off the hounds and permit no further open hearings on this shady deal. The committee which previously had voted for open hearings suddenly reversed itself. Apparently the public is not to be permitted further enlightenment on a subject charged with political dynamite for people high in official circles. It is, indeed, a powerful hand that can reach out and squelch investigations which appear leading directly toward administrative unfaithfulness or something infinitel worse—suppression of the proper functioning even of the Congress itself.

It is a historical fact, so thoroughly established that no one even attempts to refute it or deny it, that the very first step toward the enslavement of any nation is the suppression of free speech, free press, and, in this modern day, free radio.

Throughout the history of the United States, and in the histories of all other countries, there has not been an honest statesman, no matter what his political faith, who has not stated over and over again that the suppression of free press and free speech leads directly to suppression of all the other liberties of the people, and, finally, to the destruction of their total freedom.

I do not believe the American people who voted for Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term want totalitarianism in this country. I do not believe they, any more

than the more than 22,000,000 people who voted against Mr. Roosevelt, want freedom of speech and freedom of press destroyed in this country.

There are some misguided people in this Nation who believe they can maintain freedom of speech and freedom of press for themselves while destroying that freedom for others. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that no more stupid, wicked, traitorous, and utterly insane policy could be followed than that. The very people who are today seeking to curb free speech and free press are the very people—and I refer to the Communists—who in times past, and up to this good hour, have yelled the loudest for freedom of speech and freedom of press, but only when it came to their speech and their press.

Just as oppression of any minority, no matter what minority or how small a minority, opens the way for the oppression of all minorities, and the destruction of free government and free society, so the suppression of free speech or free press—of any free speech or any free press—is a long step toward the total destruction of freedom of speech and freedom of the press and the whole train of dreadful and disastrous consequences which inevitably would follow.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for the Congress of the United States to investigate this whole question of terrorism on the radio, and of persecution of writers and commentators, both press and radio, who will not bend the knee to the administration. I suggest this not because of Mr. Upton Close's personal fortunes—I suggest this because Mr. Close and this N. B. C. action, like the previous action which drove Boake Carter off the airways, is a matter which interests every man, woman, and child, every lover of freedom in the United States of America.

I suggest this investigation because just such things as this business of trying to drive Mr. Close off the air are the very things that our heroic men and women are fighting on battlefields across the seven seas to prevent. Hitler kept people off the air and suppressed newspapers when he did not like them. Mussolini did that. Mr. Stalin can and does do that. But our boys who are so bravely fighting today in Italy and in Germany, and in other parts of the world are over there fighting because they want free press and free speech to live at home.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of this Congress, as a measure of fairness and justice to our fighting forces, as well as to all the rest of us, to see to it that free speech and free press are not destroyed in this great country.

I agree wholly with Thomas Jefferson when he said:

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves. . . . Whenever the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government. . . . When the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe. . . . The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties. . . . The only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted when permitted freely to be ex-

pressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary to keep the waters pure. . . . If virtuous, the Government need not fear the fair operation of attack and defense. . . .

The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. . . . No government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free, no one ever will. . . . Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost. (Source: Jeffersonian Cyclopedia.)

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental truth voiced by Thomas Jefferson has changed not a whit in the years which have intervened since he was with us. His warnings are just as significant and just as important today as they were in his day—and more so, because the radio has now been added to the press.

If one party, or one group, or one clique can take possession of the airways of this country and can drive the truth-tellers away from the microphones and away from the typewriters, then those propagandists can mislead our people, as they will, and they will destroy free government just as surely as the sun rises and sets. Why is that so? It is so because no human being who loves freedom, who loves free constitutional government, free private enterprise, and free society could for a moment want to suppress freedom of speech or freedom of press. It, therefore, follows logically that anyone who does want to suppress or destroy freedom of the press and freedom of speech does not want free constitutional government, free private enterprise, and free society.

Mr. Chairman, there has been nothing, not even the election of an individual to the Presidency for a fourth term, that holds any greater import for the American people than this attempt to drive Upton Close from the airways because some Communists somewhere, or somebody in the State Department, or in some other branch of the executive department of the Government, does not agree with his comments and wants to suppress them. I hope one of the resolutions of investigation which have been introduced will be reported by the committee, and if it is I shall support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to the widow of Hampton P. Fulmer, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, \$10,000 to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER, of New York: On page 2, after line 6, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For additional salaries at the additional rate of \$2,500 per annum, from January 1, 1945, to June 30, 1945, of Senators, Repre-

sentatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, and the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, \$668,750."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to make a point of order against the amendment, that there is no legislation authorizing such an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard on the point of order but I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Missouri has made a point of order against this advance in our own salaries. The time must necessarily come when our salaries must be made consistent with rising living costs and the extraordinary expenses to which every Member of the House and Senate has been put and will increasingly be put. It does not take, I am sure, much eloquence or factual statement to make anyone realize that the \$10,000 which we receive are woefully insufficient. Of course, we are going to be criticized if we advance our own salaries. We are going to be damned if we do, and we are going to be damned if we do not. It is going to be charged that it is a salary grab and it may be offered as an excuse that if we attempt to elevate our own salaries, other pressure groups will be in here, also asking for increases.

The only answer to that is every case must stand on its own bottom. We never take our shoes off, as the East Indians say, until we come to the river. If some pressure group comes here and wants an increase, we must consider that increase on its merits.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has his remedy. Under the rules of the House, the Committee on the Judiciary can present a resolution authorizing this increase.

Mr. CELLER. I am aware of that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What the gentleman is asking is a violation of the rules of the House. The Committee on Appropriations has been repeatedly criticized for bringing in legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CELLER. I understand that. But the gentleman's committee violated that very rule in the instant bill. It contains numerous legislative riders. I appreciate the gentleman's position. I regret that he made the point of order. In the other Chamber they could readily offer an amendment of the type I have offered, as they do constantly, and we have to accept their amendments which, if offered here, would be declared out of order.

Mr. Chairman, wartime stress has caused all kinds of expense to you and to me. We have to grin and bear it. When I first came to Congress the salary was \$7,500. In 1925, almost 20 years ago, we elevated the salary to \$10,000. There was a yell all over the land that we had no right to do it, but we did do it. It was a sort of 7-day wonder. Some editors shrieked objection. But the storm passed. Nothing is deadlier than last week's newspapers. Some of the columnists and editorial writers might advance all sorts of animadversions against it, but it will have been forgotten in a short while, primarily because it would be right and just to increase the salaries. I hope that in the not far distant future wisdom will prevail and that we will get the increase to which we are entitled.

In 1907 our salaries were increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and in 1925 they were increased from \$7,500 to \$10,000. In these 20 years much water has gone over the dam. Indeed the dollar went much further in 1925 than it can stretch in 1944. A Member of Congress can only, with great difficulty, make both ends meet—live in the style befitting his station, send his children to school and college, and endeavor to lay by a small competence for the future. Many States provide no pension system. Fortunately, my own State of New York does provide a pension system to which I contribute yearly. That is not the situation in most States.

I would be willing to go back to the \$10,000 if, and when, taxes are lowered, the emergency is over, and the cost of living is reduced.

We jumped up the salaries of Government employees by increasing the work-week from 39 to 48 hours, with overtime pay. In fact, we jumped the Government employees 20 percent on the first \$2,900. But we fear to advance our own cause.

A Congressman knows no hours. There is no ceiling on his time. A 15-hour working day is quite common. Furthermore, campaigns must be made every 2 years. It is difficult to make them in most districts at a cost of less than \$1,500 to \$2,000. A campaign often consumes 3 months' time during which congressional activity continues. The time for campaigning must be taken out of whatever business or profession the Congressman is engaged in.

A Congressman's job is now a full-time job. There are no long adjournments, no long recesses. Formerly, we used to have "lame duck" sessions from December to March, and then did nothing from March to December. That was called the short session. Then there was the long session, which was from December to about June. Thus during the short session year, we were practically free from activities from March to December, and in the year of the long session we were free from June to December.

The constant attendance in Washington and the time expended at home—whenever one can get home—affords little or no opportunity to practice a profession or to conduct a business. Thus opportunities for earning extra compensation are at a minimum.

Every Congressman maintains two homes—one in Washington and one in his district. We are only allowed mileage covering transportation once to and from Washington each session. I make the trek to Washington and back to New York every week. Most Congressmen within say 750 miles of Washington do likewise. The cost of these repeated journeys is considerable. A deficit at the end of the year is usual.

Of course, we will be castigated if we would fight for the increase. We should be used to this. We should be hard-boiled in this regard. Frankly, if the facts were made known to the rank and file of the citizenry in every Congressman's district I am sure the response would be in our favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 2, after line 9, insert the following:

"ADDITIONAL CLERK HIRE

"Effective January 1, 1945, the clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of \$9,500 per annum, and such officials and chairmen of standing committees (other than the Committee on Appropriations, which is governed by other law) may rearrange or change the schedules or salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of \$5,000 per annum, and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than \$5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That such changes as may be made in consequence hereof shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, or thereafter, beyond the additional amount herein authorized for clerk hire for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and an amount equivalent to the difference between the aggregate amount appropriated for salaries of a standing committee for the fiscal year 1945 and the amount required to increase the compensation rate prevailing on December 6, 1944 (in case of a vacancy, the rate last paid), to the clerk of a standing committee to a rate not in excess of \$5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That no compensation rate shall be established in pursuance hereof which is not a multiple of five: *Provided further*, That Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and committee chairmen, on or before the 10th day of the month in which rearrangements or changes of salary schedules are to become effective, shall certify in writing such rearrangements or changes to the disbursing office, which shall thereafter pay such employees in accordance with such rearrangements or changes: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall supersede any law in conflict therewith.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for committee employees, to be available solely for expenditure for additional compensation for clerks to standing committees, as authorized in the preceding paragraph, \$42,630.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for clerk hire, Members and Delegates, \$657,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and provides funds not authorized by law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I will not object to the gentleman's proceeding as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] did, and asking for 5 minutes to speak or 10 if he wishes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I should like to say to the gentleman now that I am going to accept the explanation he made to the House a few minutes ago, that it was absolutely necessary for the committee to put legislative riders on this bill; and I am not going to be so mean in view of his explanation and what I think about his views in reference to appropriations to make points of order against those legislative provisions. I think the gentleman can withhold his point of order just a minute until I say what I desire to. It might be—I cannot tell but I hope and pray—that after I get through he will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I am discharging my responsibility as the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. I was directed by the Committee on Accounts to ask the Appropriations Committee to place this amendment in the deficiency bill. It is existing law with two changes: One is to add \$3,000 for additional clerical hire for each Member; the other change is to strike out the \$4,500, which is now the limit, and increase to \$5,000 the amount which can be paid one employee. Those are the only changes.

This amendment results from appeals from more than a majority of this House to me as chairman of the Committee on Accounts and to members of the Committee on Accounts.

While the gentleman from New York was speaking—and I read from the transcript—he said:

This other situation—

Speaking of the one that is before us now—

is a situation that can be handled very promptly and very quickly by concurrent resolution or by action by the Committee on Accounts.

I asked the gentleman to yield and he very kindly yielded and I said:

The gentleman certainly is too well informed on parliamentary law to know that he cannot amend the law by concurrent resolution.

Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] follows with the statement:

Oh, I never said anything of the kind, and the gentleman could not infer anything of the kind from what I said. I do not think I will yield further because I do not care to go into a discussion of that type with the gentleman.

Now, the gentleman did say a "concurrent resolution."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. My recollection is that I said "joint resolution."

Mr. COCHRAN. The transcript says "concurrent" and I distinctly heard him say it.

Mr. TABER. I am satisfied it is wrong.

Mr. COCHRAN. All right. As to the action of the Committee on Accounts, it has already been taken. No member of the Committee on Accounts is opposed to this proposal, but one member has stated he believes this should go over to the next Congress.

One member is absent from the city, and I do not know his views. Every other member of the committee approves the amendment and directed me to follow this procedure.

There are legislative proposals in this bill, as I stated before, and no legislative committee in any instance has approved these legislative proposals. This is for the legislative branch of the Government, and your Committee on Accounts, which has jurisdiction, has approved the proposal. It seems to me if the Appropriations Committee is going to bring in these legislative proposals for the executive branch of the Government, that we ought to be able to present one for the legislative branch, and I may say that I follow the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he states that these legislative proposals for the executive branch are absolutely essential. I am not going to make a point of order against any one of them, in view of what the gentleman has stated. I, therefore, appeal to the gentleman and to other members of the committee to let this matter go before the Committee and let the Members decide for themselves whether or not they want to agree to this amendment.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is why the Committee on Accounts did not follow the regular procedure and report a resolution on this subject in the regular legislative way?

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say that the agitation for this started after we came back here on November 14. It takes a bill, not a resolution, because you are amending existing law. It has to pass this body; it has to pass the Senate; and it has to be signed by the President. We have carried legislative riders on appropriation bills time and time again. Everyone understands what the proposal is. If the Members want it, let them vote for it. If they do not want it, let them vote it down. I have discharged my duty as chairman of the Committee on Accounts by following out the instructions of the committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman inform the House whether there is a precedent in connection with this bill now before the Committee for the insertion of legislation on an appropriation bill such as the gentleman has offered?

Mr. COCHRAN. Why certainly. It has been done time and again, and there are legislative proposals in this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am speaking about the bill before the Committee today.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is no bill before the Committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I refer to the appropriation bill now pending before this committee, and I ask whether legislation has been offered to an appropriation bill of this nature before. Has an amendment been offered to this bill before carrying legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will take the report he will find about 10 or 15 limitations and legislative provisions in this very bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why do we not have the courage to face the situation and provide the help we need?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the argument I advanced. There might be an amendment in here providing for something for the Navy Department that the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs, has never considered.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is not a Member of this House who is not completely overwhelmed with mail that comes to his office every day. We ought to have courage enough to vote this.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The situation being what it is, that the language the gentleman proposes is subject to a point of order, I do not feel that the Committee on Accounts is discharging its responsibility in the matter if it merely offers an amendment to a bill which is subject to a point of order. I still do not understand why the committee should not report a bill covering the subject which could then receive consideration by the Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that one reason why it is presented at this time is because it has been suggested that if the House agreed, it would certainly pass the Senate and I am sure the President would not veto it. If that happened, then when the Members go home for the holidays they could get the extra clerk provided for in this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to this situation that while the point of order of the gentleman from New York would be sustained, the amendment offered by the gentleman occupies an entirely different position than an amendment offered on the floor. The gentleman's committee has acted upon it. It is true that his committee has not reported out a bill, but his committee has acted upon it. True, the amendment could be ruled out on a point of order, undoubtedly, nevertheless the situation is different than if some Member had offered the amendment without the committee to which it would ordinarily be referred having passed upon it. The Committee on Accounts has passed upon it. It comes before us in an entirely different situation, from a practical angle. The only question the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] raises, is, "Have you got the courage to meet the question?" I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in recognition of the situation that exists, will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman intend to appeal from the decision of the Chair on this matter?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. I must concede the point of order if it is made. I admit it is subject to a point of order. I think I know enough about the rules to know that. The rules must be obeyed.

I appeal to the gentleman from New York to let the Members decide this question for themselves.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who represents the whole State of Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. May I call attention to this fact, that there are more Members on the floor of the House at this moment than there have been on many occasions when bills were considered. There is no subterfuge about this. All of us are conversant with it. It has been discussed in the public press and the country I am sure approves this proposition. No objection is raised to legislation on this appropriation bill to at least 15 items listed on pages 18, 19, and 20 of this report, and if there should be, I am sure such objection would be withdrawn.

Every Member here, I am certain, is entitled to additional help in order to take care of his constituents promptly and satisfactorily.

I trust that the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Let me again impress on the Members of the House that the legislative committee having jurisdiction under the rule has passed

upon this question in the affirmative and has instructed me, first, to present it to the Committee on Appropriations and urge that it be placed in this bill; second, I have been asked to present the resolution on the floor of the House, which I have done.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. If we have to follow the procedure outlined by the gentleman from South Dakota, we will have to introduce a bill, which must be passed by both Houses and signed by the President, then we must go before the Committee on Appropriations again and ask them to appropriate according to that bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. A bill covering this subject is not privileged. The only privileged bills handled by the Committee on Accounts are those affecting the contingent fund. This does not affect the contingent fund. Therefore, we would have to go before the Rules Committee and get a rule.

I again appeal to my friend from New York. I have stood here on the floor of the House with him and fought for reductions in appropriations for many years. I know I would not be here advocating this if I were not firmly convinced that it is an absolute necessity for Members to have additional help in order to handle the business of their office efficiently.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I feel that this is not the way to bring it up. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1945, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to pay from available appropriations actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving while away from their permanent homes or regular places of business in an advisory capacity to the Commission with or without compensation from the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 8, and running down through line 14, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION
OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

For all necessary expenses, fiscal year 1945, of the Office of Contract Settlement established by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, including fees and expenses of witnesses; travel expenses, including (1) expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of said office, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their permanent homes or regular places of business in an advisory capacity to or employed by the Office of

Contract Settlement without other compensation from the United States, or at \$1 per annum, and (3) upon the approval of the Director of Contract Settlement, expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobile (and including per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment), of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis; printing and binding; maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; contract stenographic reporting services; and personal services in the District of Columbia, \$289,700.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 17, and running down to and including line 17 on page 6, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this provision is in order under the new law, that has just been enacted at this session of Congress, the Office of Contract Settlement law, Public Law No. 395, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the language on page 6 beginning with "(3)." That is legislation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These are merely expenses incidental to the conduct of any office authorized by law, Mr. Chairman, and unquestionably are in order on the bill as proposed. The law itself imposed no restrictions whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the gentleman's attention to line 7 on page 6.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, that is in the nature of a limitation. If that language were not contained in the bill, there would be no limitation whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair refers to lines 7 to 12.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, that is with respect to travel. This is in the nature of a limitation, referring to the limitation set by the standardized Government travel regulations. If that was not included here, there would be no limitation. It could not be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman maintain that it is an authorization for travel in privately owned automobiles?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this merely provides in the usual way, as in all the departments, the authority to carry out the law as enacted in Public Law No. 395. I do not see how it could be construed in any other way. It is the method and the means ordinarily provided in all the departments for carrying out legislation of this character.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri, referring to line 23 on page 5, state whether there is any authority in law for payment of \$10 per

diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their permanent homes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when a law is enacted by Congress, the authorization provides for the administration of that law, both as to its spirit and its letter. The authorization here involves and includes all the methods ordinarily used by the departments in the administration of such laws. It would be inconsistent to enact a law and then hold there is no authorization to administer it.

These are not extraordinary provisions. These are ordinary provisions under which all laws of this character are enforced. Unquestionably, these details for the administration of the law, which are the ordinary means used by the Government in the administration of law, are authorized at the time the law is enacted.

The law having been passed, Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to bring in here the normal, ordinary, and regular provisions for carrying it into effect.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, admitting all that, it does not have anything to do with the objection, because here is a legislative provision which authorizes \$10 to be spent in an entirely different way than the other, as provided in the bill to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, some provision has to be made in the administration of the law, for the necessary travel expenses. Whether you do it in one way or another way, when both ways are recognized as being legitimate and as being common practice under the administration of the departments, it is in order. Laws cannot be administered unless travel expense is taken care of.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BONNER). The Chair wishes to call to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan, section 22, "Use of appropriated funds," item (b) of the Contract Settlement Act:

To use any such funds appropriated, allocated, or available to it for expenditures for or in behalf of any other contracting agency for the purposes authorized in this act.

Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Uniform allowance: On request of the Federal Security Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of \$300,000, from unexpended balances of appropriations for the Public Health Service, fiscal year 1944, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of allowances for uniforms to regular and reserve commissioned officers of the Public Health Service pursuant to section 607 of the act of July 1, 1944 (Public Law 410).

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the uniform allowance provision beginning in line 25, page 6, and ending in line 9, on page 7, as legislation on an appropriation bill. It diverts money appropriated for one purpose to an entirely different purpose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation, \$300,000, is a reappropriation; the appropriation of an unexpended balance in lieu of making a

direct appropriation for the purpose. Of course, if it were a direct appropriation for the purpose it would be in order and, therefore, a reappropriation would be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard further on the point of order, or does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care to be heard, Mr. Chairman, but I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that it is a reappropriation, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

The words "other services" appearing in the proviso clause under the head "Salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia and adjacent area," fiscal year 1945, shall be deemed to include teletype service and telephone switchboards or equivalent telephone-switching equipment serving one or more governmental activities in buildings operated by the Public Buildings Administration where it is found that such service is economical and in the interest of the Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words "Teletype service and" in the paragraph just read, on the ground that they constitute legislation and would make funds available for projects not authorized by law.

I may say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that I think there is no objection to the installation of teletype services in certain agencies of the Government, but as provided in this paragraph and in the paragraph immediately following there would be established a broad authorization to install teletype services wherever they could be put in any building administered by the Public Buildings Administration. It seems to me entirely too broad. This question has been discussed before the Independent Offices Committee and the belief there was that teletype installations should be permitted only in specific instances where a definite need is shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is no ground upon which the point of order against this provision can be sustained. This is a regularly established and recognized means of communication which any department is authorized to use in furtherance of the administration of its duties. There is no law under which it is denied, no provision of law under which it can be excluded. It is merely one of the regularly included provisions for carrying out the law and I see no grounds at all on which the point of order can be sustained.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the following colloquy in the hearings on this item, page 125:

The CHAIRMAN. Why should it be necessary to make this modification?

Mr. CAMERON. That is a change in language for the P. B. A. in order to facilitate the handling of the reimbursable services transferred from O. E. M. Their communi-

cation and leasing services were transferred to the Public Buildings Administration as of October 1, 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not handle it under the present limitations?

Mr. CAMERON. That is right.

On the record of the hearings, then, this bill at the point cited is a change of law. It changes existing legislation by providing that the words "Other services" shall be deemed to include teletype services." On the record of the hearings themselves, as brought out by the chairman, an existing limitation is proposed to be changed. Consequently, it does change existing law.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That, of course, is true. Of course, you have to put it in the bill; but there is no law against including it in the bill, the committee having reported it. It does not change existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. On the basis of the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair must sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation "Salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds outside the District of Columbia," fiscal year 1945, shall also be available for the furnishing of quarters, maintenance, and teletype or other services on a reimbursable basis to any governmental activity and for expenses incident to moving any governmental activity in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "Teletype or" in line 6 of the paragraph just read for the reasons previously stated in the point of order on the preceding paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is precisely the same proposition we had in the previous paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Consumer expenditures and savings study: For all expenses of the Department of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, including individuals, necessary to collect, compile, and analyze statistics with respect to the consumer expenditures and savings in predominantly rural areas, and to publish the results thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase of books and periodicals; and reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses of travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; fiscal year 1945, \$830,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language appearing in line 13, page 18, down to and including line 19 on page 18.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph on the ground it is legislation not authorized by law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, was I recognized or not? I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TABER. All right. I thought the gentleman was through. I have an additional point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Chair thought the gentleman from Michigan had finished his point of order and recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw it if the gentleman wants to continue his objection. It is all right with me.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the whole paragraph, lines 3 to 15, page 18.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consumer income study: For all expenses of the Department of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, including individuals, and in collaboration with the Department of Commerce, necessary to collect, compile, and analyze statistics with respect to the consumer income of farm families, and to publish the results thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase of books and periodicals; and reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses of travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; fiscal year 1945, \$210,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraph just read is legislation on an appropriation bill and proposes an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is beginning in line 16?

Mr. CASE. Line 16, page 18, to line 3, page 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have the same situation here, Mr. Chairman, as in the preceding paragraph. We concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 19, line 3, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

"The limitation on expenditures under the 1944 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices established in the fourth proviso clause of appropriation 'Conservation and use of agricultural land resources,' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby increased from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000 (exclusive of the \$12,500,000 provided in the

Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, for additional seed payments)."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. The change of a limitation is a change of existing law, and it has been so held repeatedly.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act authorizes the promulgation of programs to cost not in excess of \$500,000,000 annually. In the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944 the Congress undertook to impose a limitation of \$300,000,000 upon the administrative authorities in the promulgation of the over-all program for the calendar year 1944, which program included not only payments and grants for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices, but the furnishing in advance of seeds, limes, fertilizers, trees and other agricultural materials to be used in soil-conservation work and to be charged against the benefits accruing to the farmers in subsequent crop years.

I think that a correct understanding of the amendment which I have proposed involves reference to the Budget document in which it was submitted to the Congress, House Document 793, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, in which this identical language was recommended by the Budget, and in the explanation of the language it is clearly pointed out that it does not involve the expenditure of any additional moneys. In other words, this amendment, if adopted, does not appropriate or make available to the administrative authorities one single dollar of moneys which are not already available to them but it simply authorizes the use by them of moneys which have been allocated to the seed, fertilizer, lime, and tree program for the discharge of liabilities incurred under the program for the payments and grants for soil- and water-conservation practices. It is, therefore, in effect a reallocation of the funds which have already been appropriated by Congress.

I may say that that original allocation of funds was not made by the Congress in the enactment of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944, but was made by departmental authorities without mandatory instructions from the Congress to make such allocations, although it probably was a matter within their administrative discretion. So I insist that the Congress by the imposition of the limitation in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944 did not so tie its hands as to make it impossible for the same Congress or for a subsequent Congress to appropriate funds or to review and revise the allocation of funds already appropriated for the purposes outlined in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, so long as it does not exceed the limitation for maximum appropriation provided in that act, which, as I have pointed out, is \$500,000,000.

I respectfully insist, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is in order and the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

XC—564

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised by the gentleman from New York is correct, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 19, line, 3 insert:

"CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

"The funds appropriated in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, under the head 'Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources,' notwithstanding any allocation thereof heretofore made by departmental order, may be used to discharge in full payments and grants earned by farmers in carrying out authorized soil and water conservation practices."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it changes existing law.

It is apparent from the reading of it that if it were not legislation, there would be no occasion for offering it, that if it did not require legislation to permit the reallocation of these funds there is no reason why the Department would not have done it before. There would be nothing to stop it. So it is perfectly apparent that this is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York contend that there is not authorization for the appropriation of these funds?

Mr. TABER. No; not that there is not authorization, but that the funds were appropriated. This is the picture. In the act there was a limitation that prohibited more than \$300,000,000 from being expended for this purpose, but there is another provision of law that provides for the reallocation of these funds. That allocation has been made. This proposes to permit that allocation to be changed. Therefore, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is not that the appropriation in itself is not authorized, it is that this changes existing law. Existing law stated what the practice should be in allocating these funds. That has been done, and no new allocation can be made without new legislation. This is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman contending that where error is found in the allocation, the error cannot be corrected under existing law by an appropriation to carry out the intent of the law?

Mr. TABER. I do not think we can declare what the intent is. If the allocation was made improperly, we can correct it without any legislation at all.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair may interrupt the gentleman, if they have the money they could correct it.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what is being sought to be done now, to correct the allocation.

Mr. TABER. That is, to correct the allocation, to make it different than the way the Department did it. That would not be something we should do here by legislation. That is not an appropriation of funds. It is legislation, rather than appropriation of funds. It is not a

matter that is authorized on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order, to state a point for the further consideration of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, personally, I have considerable sympathy with the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, so far as the farmer is concerned, but I do not believe that the adjustment should be made at the expense of the farmers to whom payments or allocations have already been made. If I understand the amendment which is now offered correctly, it will require that allocation heretofore made, and possibly payments heretofore made, be canceled and a new allocation be made. If my interpretation of the amendment is correct, it seems to me it would impose additional duties on Government officials. The amendment refers to allocations heretofore made. As I understand the amendment now offered, it says that, notwithstanding the allocations heretofore made, money which was appropriated by the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1944-45 shall be available without respect to that allocation. Now, it may constitute a reappropriation, but if that money has already been committed and allocated and, in some instances, paid, it would seem to me to create an impossible administrative situation and be subject to the objection that it imposes additional duties upon administrative officers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I recognize the fact that the gentleman's argument is addressed to the merits of the proposition and not to the point of order, which is pending. Let me assure him it does not involve canceling of a single application of a farmer for any benefits under the provisions of the appropriation which was made in the 1945 Agriculture Appropriation Act but, on the contrary, the officials who testified before the committee in the hearings before the subcommittee were explicit in their testimony that what is proposed is the utilization of funds for this other program which would not be needed and which might be used in discharging the Government's obligation under the soil-conservation program, without injury to the other features of the program carried on under that item of appropriations. So the gentleman's fears are entirely unfounded. However, I think that question addresses itself to the merits of the proposition and not to the point of order which has been submitted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the Committee further. My point was that if it imposes additional duties on administrative officials, it might be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. If the Chair desires to hear argument in opposition to the point

of order, I shall be glad to be heard. It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order advanced is entirely without basis.

The point of order advanced against the preceding amendment, that is, the amendment which I offered just before I offered this one, was that it undertook to raise the limitations provided in the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1944 from \$300,000,000 to \$313,000,000. While I do not agree with the logic of the objections which were offered to that amendment, certainly those objections were considerably stronger and had greater basis than the objections heard here, where there is no attempt at all being made to increase the limitations which were provided in the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1944, but simply to provide for the use of funds already appropriated by Congress in the 1945 Agriculture Appropriation Act, as to the allocation of which Congress made no provisions. It simply authorized their use as a whole for the payment of soil-conservation and water-conservation benefits, and for the carrying on of this seed, fertilizer, lime, and tree program and for the payment of administrative expenses without directing what part of it should be used for the one purpose and what part for the other, and not directing what would be the allocation by administrative authorities of the Department of Agriculture, but as I said a while ago, perhaps making it permissive for regional allocations to be made.

And now it is said that Congress cannot do now what it omitted to do in the passage of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1945, and provide that any or all of this fund of \$300,000,000 can be used for the purpose of discharging the Government's obligations in the soil-conservation program for soil- and water-conservation payments. To say that Congress by the enactment of legislation in which it made no provision for the allocation of funds had tied its own hands, and that, therefore, during the same session in another bill it could not undertake to make such an allocation, to my mind is absolutely without reason or basis, as a logical argument. I can see no reason why the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is an admission that this is legislation upon an appropriation bill. In other words, the Congress undoubtedly has the right to change a regulation or limitation that it has made, but it can only do it by some other bill than on an appropriation bill. That is the situation that seems to present itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that this is a reappropriation of formerly appropriated money, so as to carry out existing law and, therefore, overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I do not intend to impose upon the good nature of the committee, since I discussed this matter at some length in the committee under general debate earlier in the afternoon.

This merely involves the carrying out of the obligations of the Government to the farmers of the country, made in an effort to induce those farmers to participate in the soil- and water-conservation program, in good faith, and it does not involve the expenditure of a single dime of the Government's money, in addition to that, which you have already appropriated for this purpose, but merely authorizes a shift in the allocation of funds to purposes for which the funds are now needed, and will not be used, whether you take this action or not, in the payment of grants due under the soil- and water-conservation program. If you do not do this, the result is going to be, as I pointed out earlier in the afternoon, that in some of the States of the Union, where the farmers have exceeded the amounts of money allocated to those States, the farmers will be paid in full because there will be other States in the region where it is not needed, where funds can be diverted to pay contracts of the farmers located in these States which have participated to a degree greater than anticipated by the administrative authorities, whereas in other States located in regions where States utilized all of the funds allocated to them, farmers in exactly the same situation will have their claims reduced by perhaps 20 or 25 percent, and in some instances as in the case of the State of Louisiana by perhaps 44 percent. Now I say that in good faith the Congress of the United States ought not to permit the Government to welsh on its contracts with these farmers. I think it ought to make good and the only way to make good is by the adoption of this amendment which I have submitted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The amount carried in the appropriation is essential and necessary to enable the payments to be made on the contracts that have been executed by the Government.

Mr. TARVER. Where the farmers have gone to the expense of carrying out their part of the contract.

As I said earlier in the afternoon it is true that there was included in the contracts some provision in fine print to the effect that if the Congress did not make the money available they could cut down on the amounts due the farmers under their contracts. But the farmers of the country had no right to anticipate that Congress would not make the money available to carry out the Government's obligations. They will consider it as I consider it if you fail to make this money available for discharging the Government's obligations that the Government has without cause and without reason welshed on its contracts to the farmers of the country; and I know of nothing you could do that would be more injurious to the soil-conservation program or anything more calculated to destroy participation in the program in those States where the farmers lose out because of this unfortunate situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say that in my State, and I know the same is true in various other States, the farmer did not get his final allotment until after the 1st of July, and by that time he had already carried out the practices requested of him, had bought the sulfur, had bought the things necessary. To come in now and cut them down is rank injustice.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me for an observation—

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It occurs to me that those who are opposing the Tarver amendment would be willing to penalize the farmers, when what they really want to do is to penalize the Department of Agriculture. The fact is the Department had no possible way of knowing how much the American farmer could or would produce. The farmer was called upon to produce more and more for the war effort and he answered that call in a marvelous manner. For this Congress to fail to keep faith with the farmer would be inexcusable and indefensible. As a member of the committee reporting the pending bill I feel that the farmers will be done a rank injustice if the Tarver amendment is not adopted. In Oklahoma his soil-conservation payments would be reduced 18.4 percent. The manufacturer who overproduces for the war is paid in full—cash on the barrelhead. Surely this Congress is not going to reward the farmer for patriotically producing for war by penalizing him to the tune of over 18 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. The net effect of the gentleman's amendment is to strike out the sectional lines which were drawn in the allocation of these funds, and where a State has funds which it may not use they can be used in another State in the region. The effect would be to strike out the regions and permit funds not used in one place to be used somewhere else.

Mr. TARVER. The effect of the amendment, I may say to my friend from Mississippi—briefly because I have not time to go into it in detail—is to insure that every farmer in this country who signed a contract to carry out certain conservation practices at a stipulated price will be paid whatever the Government promised to pay wherever he lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. The question pending before the committee at this time is relatively simple and it is tremendously important. There is a provision in the law which provides that in soil conservation payments the Department of Agriculture could not pay out more than \$300,000,000 in any one year. The appropriations for 1944, for this crop year,

were not made until June, but the farmers, of course, began this crop long before January, not to speak of June 1944. The Department of Agriculture, as required by law, went out and made detailed arrangements with these farmers long prior to June 1944. We provided for that. It was impossible for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to know exactly to what extent the farmers would cooperate in earning these payments. Moreover, this is the first year when all of these triple A payments are to be based solely upon soil conservation practices, like terracing and things of that sort. Heretofore the program has to some extent been based upon commodity payments, such as so much per pound for cotton and so forth, and upon soil-conservation practices such as terracing.

The Department of Agriculture made the best arrangement it could. It is amazing to me that they could hold it to within \$13,000,000 of what they needed during these days of war and uncertainty. But, of course, no human being knew to what extent our agricultural producers would cooperate until long after the bill had been passed. Now the Department hedged somewhat and saved back a reserve of \$8,000,000 which it is in position to use in order to partially right this injustice. They need to draw from other funds available to the Department under appropriations and acts heretofore provided by Congress an additional \$13,000,000 to pay everybody what everybody has been promised for cooperating in this war-food program.

The representatives of the Government have gone out all over this Nation and they have told the farmers that we have got to go all-out and produce and produce and produce to win the war; so the farmers went to bat and they exceeded the expectation of the Government and the Department of Agriculture in their enthusiasm to carry out this program to the extent of practices amounting to \$13,000,000 more than provided.

For example, in the State of Vermont they exceeded the practices and earned more than 1 percent in addition to what had been anticipated; in the State of Rhode Island 8 percent; in the State of Connecticut they overearned the payment 6.5 percent; in the State of New York it was only eight-tenths of 1 percent; in the State of Missouri, 18 percent; in other words, 27 States of this Union overearned the premiums which had been promised to them, which means that this proposition is not a sectional matter as between the South, on the one hand, and the North on the other hand. This is a proposal involving, as I say, most of the States of the Union in one way or the other.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This amendment should be adopted. The producers must receive the payments which they have been led to expect they would receive. Let me ask if the pending amendment is not adopted, it means in those 27 States the farmers will re-

ceive less than the amount promised them by their Government?

Mr. MAHON. It does not mean that in all 27 States the farmer will be discriminated against, because there is some leeway. Some States and regions did not earn as much as the others. However, most of these States will be discriminated against unless the amendment is adopted. In a large percentage of those States it would mean that the Government has in the opinion of the farmer broken faith with the farmer who has gone his whole limit to produce food and fiber for victory.

West Virginia has overearned its payment; Kentucky has overearned; Arizona by 43 percent; Colorado, 5 percent. Other States are Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming—Wyoming by 34 percent. Then there are all of the Southern States with the exception of Florida.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is nothing left for us to do but to make available from funds now available to the Department of Agriculture for other purposes this additional sum of \$13,000,000 in order that we may follow through on this program and permit the people who have been producing food for victory to get the amount of money they were led to believe they would get when this program was initiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is some merit in the contention advanced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], but I think also there is an issue involved here that transcends the money consideration. When we passed the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 we very specifically used the language that the total expenditures were not to exceed the sum of \$300,000,000. It occurs to me that was something of a mandate upon the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. It affirmed the intent of Congress which stated that the soil-conservation-practices payments shall not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000. It was a mandate to them also to follow out certain alternatives such as reduction in payments, I would say, if they found that the program was over-subscribed. That is a wholly administrative matter. We said, "Do not go beyond the limit of \$300,000,000." So the law is extremely specific on that subject. They found that there was an oversubscription to the program. They formulated a program for farmers in certain sections of the country, and they find that they are \$30,000,000 short.

Let us carry that theory a little bit further. Suppose they had been \$100,000,000 short. Suppose they had been

\$200,000,000 short. Suppose for the fiscal years 1945, 1946, 1947 they find on administrative experimentation that they are short. I say the Department of Agriculture went over and above the limitation set, and they come back here and say, "We are sorry we misestimated the amount. We had to go over and above the amount allowed, so we need this extra money." This is not the first time this has happened.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. This is the first time we have been short on soil conservation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right; I agree with the gentleman. But I will say that this is not the first time this has happened in the Department itself. When the Farm Security Administration undertook to buy \$16,000,000 worth of land for which there was no legislative warrant, I remember so well Mr. Baldwin coming before the committee and saying to Judge TARVER, "I am extremely sorry, but the commitments have been made." The tenants and the owners were moved off, and right now there are claims before the Claims Committee against this Government for commitments made by the Farm Security Administration that they had no authority to make, and these people have not yet been paid, and the mortgagees are pressing for the encumbrances that were on the land.

How long will this go on? Can we not write a limit beyond which they must not go?

In these contracts there is print to the effect that if the money is not there it shall be scaled down.

May I say in connection with the observations made by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as to these obligations to farmers or to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], relative to this not coming into effect until July 1, 1944, that it was early in the year when we had Mr. Wickard before the committee and we had a long discussion about making these commitments, when he knew there might not be money for it and we tried to make it so clear to him that he should not commit this Congress over and above the things that we intended in this act. So there is precedent involved here. I say, frankly, I do not know how far they are going to go. Thirteen million dollars is not so important as committing this Congress after we have set a limit for the money that should be used for a part of that function.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman spoke of somebody here in Washington who knew, but the farmer did not know, and he started planting his crop in January and not in July.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the gentleman. I suppose the farmers do not always read the fine print in these contracts, and I do not suppose that it is always made clear in the press. There is equity on both sides, but there is a principle involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I simply wish to point out, when I asked the previous speaker to yield, that this amendment does not involve an appropriation of \$13,000,000 additional money or any other amount of additional money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me say at the very outset we ought to remember the distinction between the case which my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] used about people who went out and spent money without authorization of law. I concede that that sort of thing is wrong, but that is done by the departments here in Washington for which the farmers of the United States should not be penalized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Right at that point, I am wondering what we can do by way of disciplinary action on some of the agencies of Government to stop the practice.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. What can we do? I should say the only thing we can do is to warn the farmer in January before he orders his fertilizer, before he orders his sulfur, and before he does all of the things the farmers of this country do in response to the whippings and lashings and appeals of the War Food Administration. Have we not been eating pretty well in this country? And why have we been eating well? Because the farmers of this country have done a magnificent job, and a great deal of it has been done under the stimulus of these triple A payments.

I know how this matter has proceeded, and so do you. In June we passed a bill that said \$300,000,000 should be available, but do not forget that months before that the farmer was at work—that was last February—yes; in the fall of 1943, he began doing his fall plowing to get ready for the job of producing this great crop, and he believed, and he had reason to believe, upon the assurance of the Government agents, that he would get his soil-conservation payments.

I have said to you before that if all this were scaled down equally over the United States, there could not be too much complaint, because every farmer would be cut down only 4 percent, but as the matter has been administered, and I criticize the administration of it from that standpoint, certain farmers will be penalized 40 percent, and other farmers will not be penalized at all. Is that fair? If you think it is, then you should vote against the Tarver amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. If any disciplinary action is to be taken because of this apparent miscalculation, it should be taken on the Department and not on the farmers. Our farmers have a moral claim regardless of the legal question.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is right.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Does not the gentleman feel that a more apt illustration than the one used by the gentleman from Illinois would be where we encouraged so much more additional ammunition to be manufactured than was necessary, and then were called upon to pay for it?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. We did not refuse to pay for additional things that were produced in the factories. We have not questioned the great amount of money that has gone into the production of the great machines of war. Why do we tell the farmer of the United States that it is not safe to take the word of the United States Government? Thirteen million dollars is involved here, when they can spend \$109,000,000 within a single year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that Mr. Dodd's letter to the farmers said that if there was not enough allotted in that territory to take care of them their payments would be reduced pro rata. If we now pass this, we say that Mr. Dodd was not telling the truth.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No; that is not the situation at all. Mr. Dodd did not write to the individual farmer and tell him what his allotment was going to be. On the contrary, the people from the Soil Conservation Service and the people from the triple A went all over this country saying to the farmers, "Congress is going to give you what money is necessary to produce food to win the war. You pitch in and do your part and we will take care of you." The production came in. The farmers did their share. Then we say here that Mr. Dodd should have written them a letter telling them that they were not going to get their money. He did not do it.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Was not producing more food the farmers' answer to Congress and the whole country?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly. All they did was live up to what we asked them to do. When they did that, then somebody says there was something in the contract that said it was going to be scaled down. It has already been scaled down, but still there remains the fact that definite commitments have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I supported this amendment in the Appropriations Committee hearings this morning. As it appeared then and now from the discussion we have had of this proposition most of the seeming opposition to

this amendment comes from the fact that Members hate to let a department tell them what to do. Frankly, one of the chief objections I have found in my service here is the fact that most committees permit and allow the departments to control legislation before the committees. If you cannot get a departmental approval on a bill it is practically impossible to get Members of Congress—those same Members who complain every day about departments running their business—to vote out a legislative bill. But in this particular instance you waited to put this limitation on the amount of money that could be used for soil-conservation payments until June 1944, after the Department, at the urging of Congress and the President, had sent out its plea to the people of the Nation requesting them to produce foodstuffs far beyond anything the farmers of this country had ever undertaken and this Government promised to pay to these farmers certain soil-conservation benefits, as an inducement to plant food crops and in an effort to prevent the depletion or destruction of the soil by this extensive program. As has been repeatedly stated, the farmers of this Nation were patriotic and went into that program wholeheartedly. The Department of Agriculture could not tell how many of them were going into it, or how strong each individual farmer would go into the program. Naturally when the final count was in, the American farmer was on the side of safety and if he made a mistake, he did it on the side of patriotism and on the side of putting additional acreage under the soil-conservation practices and into the Government program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is not it a fact that the farmers of the Nation have already earned this additional \$13,000,000 and a failure to adopt this amendment means that the Government is violating its own contract?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the way it will be taken. But in addition to that, I want to call your attention to this fact. This Congress is the one which put the \$300,000,000 limitation on soil conservation payments in the original act, and if we had the right to put the limitation in it we certainly have the right, when we see that the American farmer has exceeded the most that we could have expected of him, we, the same Congress, still have the same right to lift that limitation by \$13,000,000, and where we have contracted for such payments as we have done here we have the duty to raise such limitation. Under the present set-up there is another inequity unless something is done. For this program the country was divided into regions. If a State in a certain region exceeded the money allotted to it by the A. A. A., as was shown by illustration, the State of Missouri, which exceeded its allotment by 18 percent, then if some other State in that region should fall below the amount of money allocated to it, then the farmers of the State of Missouri could and did collect the full amount of money

due them, though the payments for the State of Missouri exceeded its allotment by 18 percent. This was possible because other States in that region—Iowa, for instance—fell below their allotment.

But in such a State as mine, Mississippi, where we exceeded the program as did all other States in the region, unless this amendment is adopted our farmers will collect only about 60 percent of the payment due them and which they have already earned. Certainly it is unfair for the farmers of Missouri to collect 100 cents on each dollar promised and earned by them and the farmers of Mississippi only 60 cents for the same work. Think how unfair it will appear to the farmers of Mississippi who know the Government contracted to pay the full benefits. Our citizens do not particularize between the Department of Agriculture, the Department of War, the House of Representatives, or the Senate—it is all the Government; they feel that their Government asked them to do a job and they did it. If now they are not paid 100 percent of the amount promised before the work was done but only 60 percent, they certainly have a right to feel they have been misled. I think this Congress, if it wants to take a slap at the Department of Agriculture, can do it, but do not do it by striking at the patriotic American farmer.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. As I understand, in the last analysis, this is not going to mean any additional appropriation but simply going to mean moving funds in excess from one region to where there is a deficit in another region, and further prevent our Government from violating the promise to the American farmer who has done a magnificent job?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. GOSSETT. It is a redistribution, as it were, and certainly there can be no real objection to it. The Government cannot violate its contract and should not. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is permission to take funds which we have appropriated to the Department of Agriculture and authorizing the Department to take those funds and live up to the contracts which had been signed by the American farmer and the conditions and terms of which he has fully met.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is this not the situation, that they exceeded the \$300,000,000 in one activity and in several other activities they did not expend as much as they were authorized?

Mr. WHITTEN. A total amount of \$500,000,000 was authorized for this and kindred programs with a limitation of \$300,000,000 for this particular phase of the program.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Exactly.

Mr. WHITTEN. This program is within the total limits.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. This would simply take money where the Department did a little better, as far as saving was concerned, than was expected of them and where they did not quite do so good in another place, and we permit a shift from where they have a surplus over to where they have a little deficit?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is all there is in it; is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And, not to do it would be merely subterfuge and resorting to technicalities to cheat the farmers of the United States out of their just deserts.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not believe any Member of the House wants to do that. There are certain Members here who feel that the Department of Agriculture could have probably handled this program without all this trouble and within the limitations, and perhaps they could. At any rate, they did not. Now, the American farmer has earned this \$13,000,000. He was assured of payment. Certainly because of technicalities or because the Department of Agriculture underestimated the efforts of American farmers to cooperate in the program, we cannot fail to lift the limitation on this appropriation by \$13,000,000 so that these farmers can be paid what they have earned, especially where it means the use of money already appropriated and not needed for other purposes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true Congress instructed the Department of Agriculture to go out and plan this program and if the Department of Agriculture had waited until July 1, 1944, to try to stimulate production in 1944, it would have been perfectly absurd.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly. We asked the Department of Agriculture to stimulate production and to call on the farmers of the Nation to increase production in every way possible. Taking no chances on inadequate production, the Department of Agriculture entered on a large program. The farmers of the Nation cooperated fully, even better than the Department hoped. In so doing they earned under Government contracts \$13,000,000 more than even we expected. We can do no less than lift this limitation and pay to the American farmer what his Government promised for work well done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—yeas 57, nays 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for salaries and expenses, Library, Department of Agriculture, \$6,375, including the objects specified under

this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 19, after line 14, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
"BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND
AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING
"Salaries and expenses

"Agricultural engineering investigations: For an additional amount for agricultural engineering investigations, fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, \$61,100, of which sum not to exceed \$23,100 may be expended for the construction of a building to replace one destroyed by fire at the United States Cotton Ginning Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is to replace one of the buildings and the equipment therein that were destroyed by fire in September 1944.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is the amount required for the original construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This is the amount required according to the testimony in the hearings before the gentleman's committee for the replacement of the building, and is not the amount contained in supplemental estimate, which was about \$22,000 more, for a fireproof building. This is the amount required to replace the building according to the testimony before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand also that the gentleman from New York has no objection.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I extend by saying that the Cotton Ginning Laboratory was established at Stoneville, Miss., under the act of April 19, 1930. It consists of a number of buildings and of much valuable equipment. The experiments and the research work have been of great benefit to cotton growers and to manufacturers. The plant represents an investment of several hundred thousand dollars. The hearings disclose that it would take \$23,100 to replace the ginning and press building, totally destroyed by fire, and it would take \$38,000 to replace the equipment therein that was destroyed by fire. There is a supplemental Budget estimate in House Document No. 756, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, November 11, 1944, for \$83,000. This estimate, which I approve, contemplates \$45,000 for replacing the building destroyed by fire. Dr. R. M. Salter, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, testified that it would be difficult to obtain an account of priorities for the material with which to replace the building destroyed and that a fireproof structure could be constructed for \$45,000, which he recommended. I concur.

In reporting the bill the committee did not include the project without prejudice and passed it so that the consideration could be given to providing for rebuilding in the next agricultural appropriation bill. I appeared before the Deficiency Committee, and I urged that the matter was an emergency one, that if the construction of the building were delayed for 6 months it would hamper and impair the work of the laboratory. The committee finally agreed that if I offered an amendment to provide for the replacement value of the building rather than for the fireproof structure, the committee would be agreeable to including the item. While I preferred the fireproof structure, I have complied with the request of the committee and have included for the building \$23,100. I believe that finally, however, provision should be made for a fireproof structure.

Cotton is not ready for the market when it is harvested or picked. It must then be ginned, and the type of ginning determines the grade and price of the cotton.

The Cotton Ginning Laboratory was not established to design new types of gins nor to duplicate any research work done by gin manufacturers. It is the only cotton ginning laboratory in the United States. It is designed to improve by auxiliary devices cotton ginning and to improve over-all practices of cotton ginning. Improvements in ginning and improved methods of ginning have resulted from the experiments at the laboratory. There is faster ginning with an improved fiber. The value of the cotton has thus been materially increased. The experiments have been so beneficial that the last Agricultural Appropriation Act included \$20,000 to the Extension Service to enable representatives of the Extension Service to bring throughout the Cotton Belt the results of the experiments of the laboratory to the thousands of cotton ginnermen in the South.

There have been improvements in the fans, and there has been a reduction in the cost of operating fans as a result of the experiments at the laboratory.

The quality of the cotton has been preserved. The trash and foreign matter have been eliminated.

The laboratory is largely responsible for the cotton drier. It is now used throughout the Cotton Belt. The drying improves the grades of cotton.

The density of the bales has been made standard. As a result of the experiments of the laboratory, the standard space will be only 50 percent of that previously required for cotton.

The great need now is better cleaning equipment. Air-cuts in compressing must be eliminated. Cotton must be cleaned before it reaches the saws and air-cuts must be eliminated, and there must be further cleaning between the saws and the press.

I sum up by saying that as a result of the experiments the costs of cotton ginning have been materially reduced and the fiber has been preserved.

The mechanical picker is being perfected. The need therefore for better cleaning equipment is more imperative

than ever. As a result of mechanical picking there is trash and foreign matter that can only be eliminated by better cleaning equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi?

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had under consideration the bill H. R. 5887, the first supplemental appropriation bill, 1945, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes, after any other special orders entered for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to address the House today be transferred to Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UINTAH AND OURAY RESERVATION, UTAH

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill (H. R. 837) to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMTE.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the appointment of two As-

sistant Secretaries of State, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Line 3, after "state" insert "beginning immediately."

Line 4, after "of" where it occurs the first time, insert "the emergency and not to exceed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain these amendments?

Mr. BLOOM. This is the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] the other day, but the amendment as adopted in the House was that the bill should take effect 2 years after the war is over.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman means: "Go into effect 2 years after"?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; that is the way he had it, but the amendment changed it to read that it shall go into effect immediately. I spoke to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and he agreed to the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the other amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. That is the only one.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this to be a permanent arrangement?

Mr. BLOOM. No; it is to last for only 2 years after the war is over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS— PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CLERK HIRE BILL—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON AC- COUNTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill embodying the language of the amendment I offered to this appropriation bill today in reference

to clerk hire. I have also called a meeting of the Committee on Accounts for 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and I advise any Members wanting to oppose the bill that they can appear before the Committee on Accounts tomorrow morning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute to the flag by Capt. John W. Cumming.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address entitled "The American Dream" by Dr. Peter Marshall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by one of the members of the Engineering Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with certain remarks made by me in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon I may insert certain relevant material and data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Sun of December 4 entitled "Protecting the Social Security Fund."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mr. KING, and Mr. VURSELL asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.)

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today on the bill H. R. 5587 may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POLICY WITH REFERENCE TO SALARY INCREASES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I first wish to call attention to something which happened here today and that will come up again tomorrow, that is, the introduction of legislation to provide an additional \$3,000 for clerk hire. This would provide \$57.69 per week for an additional clerk. I wish to call your attention to what happened here just a few short weeks ago right here on the floor. We had up for discussion the white-collar amendment, the Andresen amendment. At that time administration leaders appeared on the floor and opposed it. The Andresen amendment would have provided that the employer could raise his employees' wages to \$37.50 a week without referring the case to Washington. It seems now, however, that we are not going before the War Labor Board or any other board, and without observing the Little Steel formula or any other formula, fix certain wage scales for certain of our own employees ourselves regardless of what may happen to millions of people who are getting \$37.50 a week or less.

Many unnecessary strikes resulted where the employer and the employees had agreed on the salary and when the W. L. B. did not act, these strikes occurred. Now it is suggested that Congress appropriate money for a \$57.69 per week clerk for the Members, without thought of the millions in the \$37.50 or less bracket.

However, today I wish to speak a few minutes on the subject of increasing congressional salaries.

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, for several months articles have appeared in various papers suggesting that Members of both Houses of Congress be provided an increase in salary at this time. The suggested increases have been from \$2,500 to \$10,000 per year.

I am prompted to take this time because of the importance of the proposal. I am ready to accept the criticism that may be involved in discussing this question today.

This proposal to increase congressional salaries at this time is ridiculous, preposterous, and indefensible.

How can anyone propose a \$2,500 to \$10,000 increase in salary for Members of Congress at the very time that over 10,000,000 American men and women have been provided a base pay rate of

\$600 per year to preserve our country? This situation in itself is a sufficient reason why no consideration should be given the proposal.

How can this increase be justified in the light of the workings of the unfair Little Steel formula that has frozen the low-income groups with the 15 percent provision? How can anyone justify an increase of \$2,500 to \$10,000 per year for a group that delegated the power to the President, whose appointed agencies provide that the low-income groups cannot obtain over a 4-cent, 5-cent, or 10-cent-per-hour increase in their salary?

Take the recent telephone operators' strike, for example. The base pay of telephone operators in a large city is shown in the following letter received from the Secretary of Labor:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, December 1, 1944.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of November 27, concerning the salaries of telephone operators involved in the recent strike in Dayton and other Ohio cities.

This strike originated in Dayton, the strikes in other cities being of a sympathetic nature. My information is that the following scale of wages for operators prevails in that city:

	Rate per week
Wage schedule service (inclusive):	
1 to 3 months.....	\$21
4 to 6 months.....	22
7 to 9 months.....	23
10 to 12 months.....	24
13 to 24 months.....	25
25 to 36 months.....	26
37 to 54 months.....	27
55 to 72 months.....	28
73 to 93 months.....	29
97 to 120 months.....	30
121 months and over (maximum).....	31

The reports of the Conciliation Service indicate that operators transferred to Dayton from other localities were paid a subsistence allowance of \$18 per week, in addition to their regular salaries. The issue in dispute between the union and the Ohio Bell Telephone Co. was the demand of the union for the removal of the transferee operators assigned by the company to the Dayton telephone exchange.

I believe this is the information you desire.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

These telephone operators were milled around for a year in their request for consideration of their problem. It was contended by Government agencies that they could not be provided an increase in their small salary because it would cause inflation, although governmental agencies admitted there had been a 29-percent increase in the cost of living. Non-Government agencies claimed there had been a 40-percent increase in the cost of living during this same period.

How can anyone justify this proposed \$2,500 to \$10,000 increase in congressional salaries when the Congress itself has passed legislation that resulted in the freezing of the income and hourly wage of the producers of the food and fiber of the Nation? This freezing has taken place although there has been an increase of from 20 to 40 percent in the things the farmer buys.

While election-time gratuities have improved the producers' economic situation temporarily, there is nothing permanent or fundamental in connection with these election-influencing proposals.

The congressional salary increases are proposed on a permanent basis.

There have been many edicts, laws, rulings, and Executive orders put into effect to freeze the salaries of most American citizens. The Congress can well afford to freeze the congressional salaries at this time.

In fact we had better drop this increased congressional salary proposal right now and exert our efforts toward more important things.

In addition, no sleight-of-hand performances should be followed. This proposed legislation should not be attached to any deficiency appropriation bill, nor any other regular bill. If this proposal to increase congressional salaries has merit, let its supporters introduce a bill that will provide them. Let the bill go to the proper committee. Let hearings be held. Let advocates of and opponents to the legislation be allowed to give their testimony. If anyone is not sufficiently interested in this legislation to introduce a bill, it cannot be justified by slipping it into some deficiency bill.

The New Deal and its agencies are honeycombed with set-ups that provide cream for the few and skim milk for the many. Let us, as a Congress, avoid being a party to this type of set-up.

Let us not waste any of the time of the Seventy-eighth Congress on this salary-increase proposal. If this new Seventy-ninth Congress, with its large New Deal working majority, wishes to consider and pass such unworthy legislation, let them accept the responsibility for so doing. Let them take the credit or discredit that would result from its passage.

I conclude and repeat that this proposal to increase congressional salaries at this time is ridiculous, preposterous, and indefensible. Consideration of this kind of legislation would have been more appropriate shortly before election time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have filed a bill intended to prevent United States' participation in violation of principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter. The purpose of this bill is to call a halt to the Government's appeasement policy which is prolonging this war, wasting lives, and building up more wars for America to fight.

Remembering how appeasement built Hitler into a menace we should realize that appeasement is the same as playing with dynamite. Hitler, remember, came to power publicly committed to lead Germany to war. Either France or England alone might have demolished Germany at the time, since Germany had no military strength worth mentioning. Instead, the powers tried appeasement. They refrained from interfering when Hitler repudiated the Versailles Treaty,

adopted conscription, started mobilizing, and remilitarized the Rhineland. They did not interfere when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, jeopardizing their African colonies; nor when Italy and Hitler overthrew the Spanish Government, securing a vital spot on the British Empire life line. They adhered to the appeasement policy when Hitler grabbed control of the Balkan countries one by one, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania—rich in coal and iron—though these little countries all had armies and were potential allies. At Munich they threw to Hitler Czechoslovakia with its important munitions industry. Appeasement built up the aggressor, Hitler, and created the present war. Now Stalin is being built up by precisely the same appeasement policy which built up Hitler.

The pressure for continuing appeasement comes largely from the so-called internationalists who want the world to be governed by a league of nations. The League of Nations plan is the rich man's Townsend plan. Our country in the years since we refused to join the League of Nations has done about all the foolish things membership in the League of Nations was intended to force us to do. Perhaps it is unfortunate that the United States did not join the League after World War No. 1 so that by this time the American people would know from sad experience that the League of Nations scheme is a will-o'-the-wisp. By refusing to join the League of Nations, we built up overpowering political pressure for it in the same way that repeated stifling of the Townsend plan has built up an effective Townsend organization.

The League of Nations scheme sounds like a bonanza not only to international bankers but also to capitalists, who see in the scheme a dazzling opportunity for making highly profitable investments in cheap labor countries without any more risk than they would incur in peaceful, orderly United States, and without having to pay the taxes to which real and personal property are subject in most States in America. Hence the scheme has become a lucrative political racket. Any artful politician who cares to do so can secure flattering publicity, heavy campaign contributions, and speedy political advancement by conspicuously embracing internationalism. The racket is very profitable for writers, too.

Thus the scheme has achieved a vast following, particularly among the politically naive, since it is seductively advertised as a plan which would keep us out of war. Others have succumbed to the argument that since it is a good idea for Americans to be ruled by a United States of America, it would be a still better idea for Americans to be ruled by a United States of the World. Really, somebody should write a book in words of one syllable with illustrations and diagrams showing why and how a world super government with all sorts of terrorists, communists, and other half-savage people participating in the government would soon level down the average American citizen to a low standard of civilization he would find intolerable. It is not as if our Government had not

gone far enough over the hill toward the poorhouse while the management of it is still confined to American citizens only.

The extent to which billions of dollars worth of advertising has lined up public opinion behind this movement would be a titillating, humorous subject to be relished and explored by satirists in the perhaps remote future when liberty of expression again becomes a reality throughout the United States, except for the fact that the consequences have already become deadly serious. The appeasement policy arising from the pressure for this scheme has already made the coming victory in Europe a pyrrhic victory—as in the story of the operation which was considered successful, although the patient died. Stalin's rapid moves toward world domination, which he could not have made without the aid of the appeasement policy, have already reduced the level of United States security in the post-war world below the danger point.

You may wonder why I bother to dissect the internationalist pressure group in the midst of my cry for an end to appeasement. Well, the correlation between the pressure for the League of Nations scheme, the appeasement policy, and the building up of another war for us to fight was well illustrated in the Moscow Conference in the fall of 1943, the story of which leaked out shortly after the conference. The American representative at the conference was the then Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is a Wilsonian Democrat. The League of Nations scheme has long been the apple of his eye. Of course, there was no good reason why the U. S. S. R., an erstwhile member of the League of Nations until expelled for aggression against Finland in 1939, should not consent to join a resuscitated version of the League when Mr. Hull requested it at the conference. Mr. Stalin, a gentleman who came up the hardest way, plays his cards for all they are worth to himself even to the extent of trumping his allied partners' aces. His representative at the conference played the coquette. Hour after hour, the Russian representative coyly refused to join the League of Nations, the dream scheme which has been a pet theme of Mr. Hull's orations all through his career in Congress, the Senate, and the Cabinet. Mr. Hull exhorted, pleaded, begged. Frantically, wildly, he said "yes" to every concession, every appeasement asked by the Russians. Finally, after securing everything he had urged, the Russian diplomat graciously agreed that Russia would join the new League of Nations. As a climax Stalin, himself, gave audience to Mr. Hull, shaking hands with him not only once but twice.

Among the concessions granted to Russia was the right of the nation whose army would be first to reach a fallen country to occupy it until after a plebiscite would be held—a concession which, as predicted in Congress at the time, virtually invited Stalin to send his armies to the Balkans in order to hold fake plebiscites and thus gain control of these strategic countries as Hitler did it in Austria, and Stalin himself did it

in the Baltics. The many newspapers that print the internationalist propaganda heralded the Moscow Conference as a great diplomatic triumph. These newspapers praised the Moscow Conference appeasing Stalin almost as enthusiastically as they once praised the Munich Conference appeasing Hitler. But the glory of the Moscow Conference was outshone within a month by the Teheran Conference at which Stalin obtained from President Roosevelt himself still greater appeasements, including the second-front invasion and the promise that the Allies would not invade the Balkans. Stalin's reason given at the time for preventing a British-American invasion via the Balkans—a strategy much easier for America than the western invasion—was that such an invasion in violation of his promise at Teheran that his armies would proceed straight to Berlin, furnishing a nutcracker operation synchronized with the Allied western front invasion, indicates that his real reason was that he wanted no impediment to his later getting the Balkans.

Since Teheran it seems that there is nothing so valuable that the United States is unwilling to concede it in order to keep up the appearances for internationalists who insist that unity must be preserved at any cost. The price the United States has genially paid in order that our President can salute Stalin as a fellow member of the league and say, "Hello, Joe. What else can I do for you?" is beyond the conception of previously recorded history. It is phantasmagorical.

The price has included giving away things which were not ours to give, rights we had already guaranteed to other governments, including Poland and Yugoslavia, and Chiang Kai-shek's government of China. When little nations have requested our State Department to rescue them from extinction by merely saying a good word for them to Stalin, they are advised to see Stalin and get along with him as best they can. They are told that such is the way quarrels are settled in Tennessee, though, under the circumstances, it is as if the Chicago police were to tell a citizen threatened with murder he should get along as best he can with Al Capone's mob. The price has included giving Stalin war supplies that our own American soldiers need. Our President has never insisted that American military attachés be permitted to stay in Russia in the usual way to check up on Stalin's requirements. The fact is that nobody in American Government really has a good idea of what Stalin requires. The policy gives Stalin whatever he asks virtually without question. Stalin's forces are using American equipment to loot and terrorize Yugoslavia and other countries, although since the election Army officials have frankly admitted that our men on the western front are impeded by equipment shortages.

The price of appeasement has already included unnecessary loss on the western front, the recent casualties being so large that apparently the War Department shrinks from revealing the current figures. But now it comes out that, thanks to the appeasement policy, these losses

are only a beginning. It is not as if you were not warned. You were told exactly what would happen while there was still time to delay the western front. You were warned that as soon as our armies entered Europe Stalin would leave the Americans to fight his war for him and go looting. He is now looting in the Balkans and up to Norway and promoting internal revolutions against governments all over creation.

Constantine Brown in the Washington Evening Star last Sunday related the whole miserable story in detail for you. Stalin's campaign for world domination has released masses of German troops from the Balkans which are now being flung against our Yanks. To prevent the Germans becoming increasingly powerful during the coming months, another Allied offensive—a risky dangerous midwinter offensive more dangerous than the first one—has been ordered because it is necessary to provide this substitute for Russia's promised cooperation. Remember, all this would not be happening except for the appeasement policy. This policy is sheer murder. Letters home reveal that some of our young men from Illinois, pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, have found themselves fighting in the fox holes in Germany after having received only 13 weeks of training. To think that we are now going to have to throw in another batch of men makes one heartsick. How lucky for the placid persons who govern the United States that here, in America as in Russia and Germany, the people are confined in a world of make-believe, created by the propaganda machine—the comatose Republic.

Since 1914 the United States has had the unavowed policy of guaranteeing the British Empire. The question now is, How much longer the British Empire can survive the appeasement policy. Communist internal revolutions, operated by remote control from Russia, have already given Russia domination over more strategic points upon the British Empire life line than Hitler ever had. British and Communist forces are now participating in a revolution against each other in Greece. A Communist revolution in Spain, a vital spot on the British Empire life line, is brewing. Britain, like the small nations, has been told by the United States that Britain must get along with Stalin as best it can. Mr. Churchill, who once said he did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, is now presiding over the liquidation of the British Empire and probably nobody knows it better than Mr. Churchill.

British reliance on the ability of the United States to save the British Empire in the event of a war against Stalin is already becoming anachronistic. Stalin's domination of key positions in the United States Government and in some important labor unions makes it questionable whether the United States, after reconverting to civilian production, could successfully reconvert back to war production and produce for war in the event of war against Stalin, because of Stalin's ability to foment strikes in the United States. In other words, it is a great question whether we could win a war against

Stalin. If the appeasement policy continues, no mere universal peacetime conscription bill would be enough to give the United States military security. What is an army without equipment and supplies? It may be unsafe during our time to permit industry to reconvert to civilian production. We may have to remain mobilized indefinitely. Our glamorous President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is likely to go down in history as the man who rescued the world from the frying pan only to throw it into the fire.

Of course, nobody wants war with Stalin. We who try to uphold the traditional American principles are the first to oppose building up wars to fight and the last to cease opposing unnecessary wars. But, unfortunately, if and when the appeasement policy has built up Stalin until he has become master of the world, it may be Russia and not America which decides when and whether the United States goes to war against Russia.

The zealots in the rich man's Townsend movement cling to the appeasement policy until they almost split their own personalities. Stalin, some of these apologists fancifully insist, means no harm. It is just that he considers himself the political reincarnation of Peter the Great—why not Ivan the Terrible?—and seeks to achieve Peter's Napoleonic ambitions—which Peter's contemporaries, you recall, were alert to nip in the bud. Some argue that all we have to do to unravel the hangman's knot which appeasement is enabling Stalin to tie around the neck of the world is wait until we nations all sit down together at the peace table—which is rather like advising you to wait until the child is born before deciding whether you want to mother the offspring of a monster. That argument appeals to what you might call the hard-headed chamber of commerce wing of the internationalist movement. That wing counsels patience, saying the United States is going to be able to handle Stalin after the war because he wants to buy so many things from the United States. As if any totalitarian power dominating the world, using the techniques both Hitler and Stalin use, could not get whatever it wanted from the United States at its own price. The trouble with some of our hard-headed businessmen is that they are just as willing as any despised New Deal professor to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs providing there is a chance for them to get just one of the golden eggs.

If Stalin really wants security for Russia, the best security he could have after Germany is subjugated, would be little, harmless, self-governing neighbors, independent as they were before Hitler gobbled them up—as the Atlantic Charter promises they shall be after the war is won. The more of the world Stalin dominates the more trouble he is going to have putting down anticommunistic movements—except, of course, that under the "Dumbarton hoax" plan, by which internationalists seek to change our Constitution because they doubt they can bludgeon many more than a bare majority of the usually docile Senators into voting for it, the United States will be

committed to fight to put down the revolts against communistic rule for him.

This bill, to prevent our Government's helping other nations violate the Atlantic Charter, should have been passed when we were at the peak of our bargaining position, before we prematurely precipitated American ground armies into western Europe. We should have delayed the invasion until Germany was reduced by bombing so as to be readily taken, and until we had some assurance from Stalin that he would not render our war effort futile. Such a bill, you recall, was introduced by me. Still, our bargaining power is not yet exhausted. We still have great military strength. American industry is not yet reconverted to civilian production. Stalin knows that we are going to vanquish Germany whether or not we get the assistance Stalin has promised, the cooperation he certainly owes us since this is still his war, even though our President has loudly claimed it. Stalin is not yet prepared to make war against the United States.

It is growing very late, but it is not yet too late to abandon our wayward, unprincipled meandering and secure the blessings of common sense to ourselves and our posterity by resolving: From now on the United States shall once more be the good American citizen in the community of nations, the strong character who cannot be cajoled nor intimidated into deviation from the paths of righteousness and justice—justice to himself and his own as well as to all his fellow citizens in the community of nations.

Sooner or later, perhaps too late, it will become clear that simple justice to which all the Allies pledged themselves when they signed the Atlantic Charter, is the only hope in a world rapidly disintegrating into a chaos of revolutions and counterrevolutions. Meanwhile, those who desire to implement their desire for sanity in American foreign policy can devote their efforts to the passage of this resolution. It will be reintroduced in the next Congress.

Bear in mind, it was fear of Stalin that helped Hitler get elected to power and motivated the appeasement policy which built him up just as it is fear of the already doomed Hitler that is building up Stalin now. That fear of Stalin is to some extent responsible for the rapidly increasing German resistance is evidenced by the fact that the Nazis are alert to keep the German people thoroughly informed of every move Stalin makes in his campaign for world domination. The passage of this resolution, yes, even the filing of it, providing it becomes known abroad, should help weaken German resistance and, of course, encourage tremendously those who struggle to regain their pre-Hitler independence.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1744. An act to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge;

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecochea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Work Projects Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee;

S. 1645. An act relating to the administration of the Glacier National Park Fish Hatchery, at Creston, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn;

S. 1877. An act to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina;

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum;

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files;

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault;

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell;

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen;

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw;

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall; and

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2061. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2062. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2063. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 313 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5587. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 193. An act to amend further section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 1481. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4709. A bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1 to September 30, 1943, inclusive; with amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 5571. A bill to omit or defer the required 5-year valuation of the civil-service retirement and disability fund for the duration of the present war and for 1 year thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5474. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization

tion of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5588. A bill to extend the renegotiation Act to December 31, 1945, and to authorize the President to make an additional extension of not more than 6 months after such date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5589. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 5590. A bill to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. R. 5591. A bill to prevent United States participation in violations of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. Res. 670. Resolution requesting the Smaller War Plants Corporation to investigate the possibilities for establishing small, independent enterprises in Alaska by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6233. By Mrs. BOLTON (by request): Petition of 113 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against enactment of such legislation as the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6234. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Pioneer Elders' Association of Chester and Delaware Counties, Pa., endorsing the action of Governor Martin ordering the closing of State liquor stores on Victory Day and recommending that all Presbyterian Churches be kept open to give public thanks therein for this partial victory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6235. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the proposed Federal housing project to be located in the city of Dearborn; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the

heavens are the work of Thine hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment: and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.

Once again we commit our dear country in the midst of a changing world to the changeless God, asking for Thy guidance for our President, and for all rulers everywhere, and for those associated with them in the governance of the peoples; giving over to Thy merciful protection our sons and daughters in all war places, whether on island, or continent, on sea or in air; and commending to Thy consoling grace all the anxious and sorrowing of our bewildered world.

Above all else, we ask for Thy help and strength that we may serve our generation by the will of God and may be admitted at last to that realm where the will of the Heavenly Father is the law of all his children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 6, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 837) to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LeCOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5219. A bill to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa.;

H. R. 5543. A bill extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purpose of certain provisions of the In-

ternal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5565. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive certain checks and money orders in payment of taxes and for revenue stamps.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge;

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecochea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Works Progress Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.;

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn;

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum;

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files;

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault;

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell;

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen;

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Phillyaw;

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassand, a minor;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1744. An act to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans, and for other purposes; and